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INTRODUCTION

After more than a century of investigation into various aspects of Konrad von Würzburg's Engelhard, its source or sources are still unknown. Moritz Haupt, when he edited the poem in 1844, simply established the fact that it resembles the tale of Amicus and Amelius. ¹ Haupt felt however that Engelhard was so different from those versions of Amicus and Amelius which he knew, 'dass entweder das lateinische buch nach welchem er dichtete (212. 6493) ein anderes war oder er selbst den stoff mit grosser freiheit behandelt hat.'²

¹ I am using the term 'tale' not to indicate the literary genre, but in the wider sense of 'narrative'. It will become clear in chapter II that the tradition of Amicus and Amelius includes several genres.

The most recent editor, Ingo Reiffenstein, can report no progress on this question. He states: 'Die lat. Version, die—nach eigenem Zeugnis—Konrad vorgelegen hatte, ist entweder nicht bekannt, oder Konrad ist mit ihr sehr frei umgegangen.' 3 All commentators on the relationship between Engelhard and the Amicus and Amelius tradition have either confined themselves to the statement that such a relationship exists, or they have repeated the views of Haupt and Reiffenstein. 4 We are thus left with an unsolved problem: is it possible that Konrad treated a known source or sources with so much freedom that it (or they) can no longer be identified?


In spite of this lack of knowledge about the source or sources of Engelhard, students of the poem refer to Konrad's treatment of his source by pointing to the 'tradition' of the friendship tale, and to those aspects of the tradition which Konrad 'altered'.


Morgenstern's method is criticised by Karl-Heinz Göttert, Tugendbegriff und epische Struktur in höfischen Dichtungen. Kölner Germanistische Arbeiten, vol. 5, Köln Wien, 1971, p. 143, note 22. Even though Göttert is aware of the problem, he dismisses it too lightly when he says, p. 147:
this tradition and of the place of Engelhard within it is essential before Konrad’s own contribution may be assessed.

In this study, I hope to show that the Amicus and

‘Diesen leicht zu vermehrenden Übereinstimmungen oder Varianten in kleinen und kleinsten Motiven steht dagegen eine jeweils in sich geschlossene und als selbständige Leistung anzuerkennende Gesamtkonzeption gegenüber. Wir können sagen, dass Konrad im wesentlichen zwei Motiven eine herausgehobene Bedeutung gegeben hat: indem er die Geschichte des Freundespaares in das mære von höhen triuwen verwandelte, gab er einmal dem Gedanken der triuwe einen neuen Sinn: jenseits der romanhaften Auffassung des Radulfus Tortarius sollte sie mehr sein als weltliche Tugend, jenseits der legendären des Amicus et Amelius mehr als trotz Verfehlung in der Heiligkeit aufgebogene überweltliche.’ Are the two versions of the Amicus and Amelius tradition which Göttert cites representative of the entire tradition? Are there versions which Göttert has overlooked and in which Konrad’s ‘Gesamtkonzeption’ is pre-figured?
Amelius tradition has three distinct branches, and that Engelhard has close affinities with only one branch, represented by the tale Amici in the Vaticinium section of the Historia Septem Sapientum Romae. In addition, and in particular, I shall show that the source of Amici (or a version closely related to it) was also the principal source for Konrad's Engelhard.

It will be necessary to extend the scope of the examination beyond the versions of the Amicus and Amelius tale. Hans Herzog's article on the influence of Chrétien de Troyes's Cligés on Engelhard,6 and Moriz Haupt's references to textual parallels between Hartmann von Aue's Der arme Heinrich and Engelhard7 demonstrate that Konrad did not confine himself to one source only. A distinction must be made, therefore, between primary sources (the Amicus and Amelius tradition) and secondary sources (any other material Konrad may have used in the composition of Engelhard).

6 'Zum Clies und Engelhard', Germania, XXXI (1886), 325 - 326.

7 In the critical apparatus of his Edition.
There are, then, three major areas which must be examined in the search for the sources of Engelhard. The first is the poem as an artistic creation in its own right. Chapter I will therefore be devoted to an examination of the structure of Engelhard. This examination will allow certain conclusions to be drawn about Konrad's method of composition. The second area is the Amicus and Amelius tradition. A survey of this tradition will be attempted in chapter II. A discussion of the third major area, the secondary sources, will follow in chapter III.

The attempt to determine Konrad's primary source will be made in chapter IV. The first step will be a two-fold process of reduction. The plot of Engelhard will be reduced to those motifs which Konrad must have taken from the Amicus and Amelius tradition. From this tradition, on the other hand, all versions will be eliminated which Konrad could not have used as a source for Engelhard. The second step will be an attempt to trace the relationship between the versions which are not eliminated. In this way I hope to show the point where Engelhard fits into the tradition of Amicus and Amelius.
CHAPTER I

THE STRUCTURE OF ENGELHARD

Konrad's Engelhard tells the story of two friends whose devotion to each other is so great that it passes the most severe tests. God finally puts his seal on their friendship by performing a miracle.

The following is a brief synopsis of the plot. It will be used for reference in the discussion of Konrad's poem.

After a general introduction on 'triuwe', Engelhard's family is described. Engelhard is one of ten sons. Like Hartmann von Aue's 'armer Heinrich' he stands far above the rest of his family as far as courtly qualities are concerned. In this respect, he possesses everything necessary for winning the esteem of the courtly society in which he lives, except material wealth. He therefore decides to leave his home and seek service with king
Fruote of Denmark, who is renowned for his generosity. His father gives him three apples when they part. Before offering his friendship to any stranger, Engelhard is to give him an apple. The stranger will be a good and true friend only if he does not eat the whole apple, but offers half of it back.

Engelhard sets out and meets two men who fail the friendship test. The third, who is called Dieterich and looks exactly like Engelhard, passes the test. They swear a friendship troth and go together to the court of king Fruote, where they are well received. Their personal qualities and their love for each other endear them to the people at the court.

The king has a daughter, called Engeltrût. She falls in love with both friends at the same time (because, like everybody else, she cannot distinguish between them). Finally, she chooses Engelhard because of his name. She pines for him, but he is unaware of her affection.

Dieterich is called back to his home by a messenger who brings the news that his father, the prince of Brabant, has died, and that Dieterich must now take up his inheritance. In a long conversation, Dieterich entreats
Engelhard to come with him, but Engelhard decides to remain at Fruote's court. The friends part.

Engeltrüt, whose unrequited love for Engelhard causes her much sorrow, does not dare to show this openly. When her mother dies, she has a legitimate reason for showing her grief. The king, who thinks that her mother's death is the only reason for his daughter's apparently immoderate lamentation, attempts to console her and appoints Engelhard as her chamberlain in order to allay her suffering. Engeltrüt now hints to Engelhard that she loves him, and he falls in love with her. When he finally confesses his love, she rejects him. Engelhard becomes love-sick. But when he is near death, Engeltrüt relents. She visits him and promises him that she will return his love if he becomes a knight and does battle in a tournament on her behalf.

Engelhard recovers, is dubbed a knight, participates in a tournament in Normandy and earns the highest praise. On his return, he reminds Engeltrüt of her promise and they meet secretly in an orchard. The king's nephew, Ritschier, while pursuing a sparrow-hawk, accidentally discovers the lovers and informs the king of what he has seen. Engelhard is tried and, since he denies the charge and Ritschier persists in his accusation, the king orders
a judicial combat.

On the pretext of going on a pilgrimage, Engelhard takes leave from the king's court and travels to Dieterich to seek advice. The two friends meet at night. At Dieterich's suggestion they exchange clothes. Engelhard remains in Brabant as Dieterich, while the latter travels to king Fruote's court in the guise of Engelhard. Every night, Engelhard places a sword between himself and Dieterich's wife, who does not discover his true identity and takes him for her husband.

Dieterich (as Engelhard) fights the judicial combat and defeats Ritschier by striking off his left hand. The king, now convinced of 'Engelhard's' innocence, gives him his daughter in marriage. Dieterich places a sword between himself and Engeltrüt. Pretending to set out on a pilgrimage, he leaves Fruote's court and returns to Brabant. Secretly, the friends exchange clothes again and each returns to his original place.

After some time, Dieterich is struck by leprosy. He leaves the court and goes to live on a lonely island. In a dream, an angel tells him that he can be healed with the blood of Engelhard's children. When Dieterich wakes up, he rejects what the angel has told him. Some time later however, he decides to travel to Denmark, where
Engelhard, after the death of king Fruote, is now sovereign.

Engelhard has a house built especially for Dieterich and the two friends spend much time together. Engelhard eventually discovers that there is in fact a cure for Dieterich's disease and he presses his friend to tell him. The latter finally does so. After an inner struggle, Engelhard decides to kill his children for Dieterich's sake, and he does this when the queen has gone to mass. He anoints his friend with their blood, and Dieterich recovers. When the nurse fetches the children at the request of Engelhard, they are alive and well. The only sign of their ordeal is a red line round their necks, in the place where their heads had been severed. Everyone rejoices at the news of the miracle. Dieterich returns to Brabant and both friends live happily until their deaths.

In a short epilogue, Konrad points out the moral of his tale: God helps the man who is 'getriuwe'. Konrad concludes with an appeal to his audience to take the 'triuwe' of the two friends as a model for their own conduct.

Several attempts have been made to analyse the structure of this plot. Heinz Rupp has suggested that
Engelhard could be divided into the following components:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>217 - 1628</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1629 - 3170</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>2954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3171 - 3586</td>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3587 - 5134</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>2918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5135 - 6504</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prolog
Bis zu Dieterichs Abreise
Engelhards und Engeltruds Liebe
Die Entdeckung der Liebenden
Rollentausch, Kampf, Hochzeit
Aussatz, Heilung, Wunder

Rupp's attempt to find a symmetrical pattern for Engelhard in which four parts of approximately equal length are grouped around a central event raises the question whether 'Die Entdeckung der Liebenden' is in fact the central event of the entire tale. It is admittedly true that the discovery of the lovers sets the stage for the first test of friendship, but Dieterich's illness is of equal importance for the second test of friendship.

---


2. In contrast to some other versions (cf. pp. 74-75, below), there is no direct connection between Dieterich's part in the first friendship test and
Furthermore, as Karl-Heinz Göttert has observed, Rupp's scheme is not in agreement with the principle laid down at the beginning of his article, in that parts III and IV differ in length by more than 10\%.

The second study of Engelhardt which includes considerations of structure is by Barbara Könneker. She bases her analysis on the observation that the

his leprosy.


4 'Genaue Entsprechungen können vorkommen, oft aber weisen symmetrisch angeordnete oder in ihren Proportionen übereinstimmende Teile einen gewissen Spielraum an Ungenauigkeit auf; d.h. "gleich grosse Teile", die Unterschiede im Versbestand bis zu etwa 10\% aufweisen, dürfen trotzdem "gleich grosse Teile" genannt werden.' Heinz Rupp, op. cit., 369.

5 'Erzähltypus und epische Struktur des Engelhard', Euphorion, LXII (1968), 239 - 277.
friendship story and the love story should be regarded as separate entities, since they differ considerably in style and treatment. In the friendship story, Könneker states, Konrad used the techniques and the style of the short epic form, while the love story may be regarded as Konrad's first attempt in the field of the MHG verse novel.

According to Könneker, the characteristics of the short epic form (Verserzählung) are: 'Einsträngigkeit der Handlung und äusserste Begrenzung in Personenzahl und Motivik, sowie knapp pointierte, auf Wesentliches sich beschränkende Darstellung, Übersichtlichkeit des Aufbaus, der durch klar heraushergestellte Höhe- und Wendepunkte gegliedert ist, und—häufig jedenfalls—die Verwendung von Leitmotiven oder Leitworten.'

The MHG verse novel, on the other hand, is characterized by Könneker as follows:

'Der Roman ist rein äusserlich zunächst, gekennzeichnet durch ein Nebeneinander mehrerer Handlungsstränge sowie durch eine grössere Zahl relativ selbständiger Personen und Motivgruppen.'

---

Freilich kommt im Roman zu diesen äusseren Kriterien ein entscheidendes strukturbildendes Element noch hinzu, nämlich das Element der inneren Verknüpfung und des Zusammenhanges aller Teile. Von der Art, wie die einzelnen Geschehniskreise ineinandergreifen und die Schicksale der Personen miteinander verflochten sind, hängt es ab, ob man im jeweiligen Einzelfall von einem Roman sprechen kann oder nicht, dessen Wesen sich im Mittelalter grundsätzlich darstellt als eine komplexe Einheit, in der es bei aller Vielfalt im einzelnen nichts gibt oder geben dürfte, das isoliert steht und sich ohne Gefahr für das Ganze herauslösen liesse.7

Könneke regards the characterisation of Dieterich as typical of the short narrative, and the characterisation of Engeltrüt as typical of the courtly novel.8

In attempting to prove her thesis, Könneker examines the structure of Engelhard. She suggests a division into three parts:

I  Friendship (Engelhard - Dieterich)  1 - 1628
II  Love   (Engelhard - Engeltrüt)  1629 - 4121

---

III Friendship (Engelhard - Dieterich) 4122 - 6504

Könneker claims that her sections I and III together form a structural unity which itself can be divided into three sections:

a) The friendship test by means of an apple
b) The judicial combat
c) The sacrifice of the children

Sections b) and c), according to Könneker, are also of approximately equal length. Könneker argues that b) 4122 - 5134 contains 'de facto' 1000 verses plus a few hundred verses in which Konrad would have given the motivation for the first friendship test if he had not decided to expand the love story. It would therefore be of the same length as the second friendship test c) which is told in ca. 1350 verses. Könneker thus postulates a

friendship tale which is characterized by an 'ausgewogene und genau berechnete Konstruktion', which Konrad altered by adding the love story. By this process, Könneker claims, Konrad attempted the composition of a verse novel and failed.

Könneker's remarks on the structure of the friendship plot are thus based on a hypothetical short epic, while the love story is treated as an amorphous whole. Konrad's Engelhard may be a failure if it is viewed in terms of only some aspects of the Classical MHG verse novel. The question remains however whether there are not other aspects of the Classical or Late Classical MHG verse novel from which Engelhard can be evaluated as an artistic unity rather than as an unfortunate attempt on Konrad's part to combine two genres.

Könneker's views have been challenged by two critics. Peter Kesting argues that the love story is an integral part of the structure of Konrad's poem. According to


Kesting, Konrad expanded the love story to make it into a further test of 'triuwe' in addition to the two friendship tests. Konrad therefore treats his theme 'nach einem einfachen, dreifach anders aktualisierten Plan, den man in folgendem Modell beschreiben kann: ein Mensch gerät in eine sehr gefährliche, ja lebensbedrohende Notlage, ein Freund jedoch kommt ihm aus triuwe zu Hilfe und stellt dabei alle Bedenken zurück. Die Rettung gelingt. Die Tat wird stets tougenliche vollbracht, gleichsam unter Ausschluss der Öffentlichkeit, da sie nämlich nicht im Einklang mit gewissen gesellschaftlichen oder moralischen Normen geschehen kann. Pflichtenkollision kennzeichnet die Entscheidung des Helfers."¹³

Karl-Heinz Göttert¹⁴ (who does not make reference to Kesting's article) bases his investigation on the observation that in the courtly MHG epic the concept of virtue determines the form of a work as well as its

The discussion of the structure of Engelhard is on pp. 255 - 259.


content. The central virtue in Engelhard, according to Göttert, is that of 'triuwe'. Göttert divides the poem into six sections and analyses Konrad's use of the word 'triuwe' (and its grammatical derivations) in each of these sections. His division is as follows:

1 - 216  Prologue  Praise of 'triuwe'
217 - 1628  Section 1  The 'triuwe' bond is established between the two friends
1629 - 4150  Section 2  The 'minne' relationship between Engelhard and Engeltrüt. 'triuwe' characterises this

relationship as well as the feudal bond between Engelhard and Fruote

4151 - 5134 Section 3 The first friendship test
5135 - 5666 Section 4 The second friendship test
5667 - 6455 Epilogue Call to the audience to emulate the friends' example

Göttert further subdivides the first part of section 4 (5135 - 5666) as follows:

1. leit: der Aussatz und seine Folgen (5135 - 5308)
2. Erstes Selbstgespräch (5309 - 5416)
3. Traum (5417 - 5480)
4. Zweites Selbstgespräch (5481 - 5548)
5. Gesteigertes leit und Entschluss zur Fahrt.

The second part of section 4 (5667 - 6455) according to Göttert contains at its centre the speech in which Dieterich reveals to Engelhard the medicine which could

---

16 This table is a summary of Göttert's analysis, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 - 134.
cure him (5962 - 6106) and Engelhard's reflection on this revelation (6118 - 6202). 18

Göttert also discusses a number of features in Konrad's narrative technique which have a unifying function in the poem: Konrad's use of parallel, contrast, and anticipation. Göttert comes to the following conclusion: 'Den Zusammenhang gewinnt Konrads Erzählung eben durch den alles Geschehen durchwirkenden Grundzug der Probe, die wiederum auf das Sichtbarwerden der triuwe bezogen ist.' 19

My own examination of the structure of Engelhard will be divided into two parts. The first part will contain a comparison of the structure of Engelhard with the structure of other versions of the friendship tale, while the second part will be devoted to an examination of symmetry and proportions within the poem.

There are certain structural features in which Engelhard differs from other known versions of the Amicus and Amelius tale. A comparison of Engelhard with some of these versions will demonstrate this. The three versions,


the Middle English Amis and Amiloun, Amis e Amilun, and the friendship tale in Hans von Bühel's Dioctetianus Leben have been chosen because they are representatives of the only known secular treatments of the friendship tale which are, like Engelhard, in the vernacular and in verse. The other romantic versions are

20 Amis and Amiloun, ed. MacEdward Leach. Early English Text Society, Original Series No. 203, London, 1937. The romance is in the East Midland dialect, and the earliest MS is from the second quarter of the fourteenth century, and probably not later than 1330. (MacEdward Leach, op. cit., p. x). 


either in Latin (No. 1 in my list of romantic MSS, Appendix A, p. 218, below), or in prose (No. 6, p. 220 in my list of MSS), or else they are influenced by the hagiographic tradition (Nos. 5, p. 220 and 11, p. 221 in my list of romantic MSS).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>0.5%</th>
<th>0.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8806-9070 = 212</td>
<td>1093-1250 = 156</td>
<td>2305-2508 = 247</td>
<td>2247-2340 = 243</td>
<td>2197-2291 = 234</td>
<td>2058-2112 = 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mott Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>0.5%</th>
<th>0.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8066-8289 = 222</td>
<td>322-524 = 202</td>
<td>749-1140 = 372</td>
<td>1394-1796 = 402</td>
<td>1299-1691 = 392</td>
<td>1194-1596 = 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brint Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>0.5%</th>
<th>0.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7910-8404 = 574</td>
<td>7396-7766 = 371</td>
<td>717-118 = 136</td>
<td>1-376 = 375</td>
<td>884-928 = 44</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes to the Table

1. The figure after the title of each tale represents the total number of verses which it comprises.

2. The percentages given represent the proportion which each motif-group takes up of the total number of verses in each poem. Round figures are given after the decimal point.

3. The considerable differences between the four texts do not allow a breakdown into smaller motif-groups. The division into eight groups does however illustrate structural differences and similarities in the four versions compared.

4. Engelhard does not start with verse 1 in this table because of the 216 verses of introduction which have no counterpart in the other versions. The percentage calculations are therefore based on the text of Engelhard minus prologue and epilogue (6239 verses).

5. Diocletianus Leben does not start with verse 1 because this version is part of a collection of tales. To emphasise its connection with the Historia Septem Sapientum, I have used the running title Von den sieben weysen meystern in the table.
A number of conclusions may be drawn from the table. Firstly, Konrad's version of the friendship tale is much longer than any of the other versions. Engelhard is in fact the longest known version of the Amicus and Amelius tale. This would suggest that Konrad may have greatly expanded the material he found in his source. I hope to show that this is the case.

The part of the tale which Konrad appears to have expanded most in relation to the other versions is the love-story. The three versions analysed in the table devote between 11.5% and 18.2% of the total number of verses to the love-story. Konrad takes up 31.5%, nearly twice the average proportion of the other versions. The emphasis which Konrad places on the love between Engelhard and Engeltrüt is further illustrated by his choice of names. Here we find, for the first time in the known history of the friendship tale, similar names given to the two lovers and not to the two friends.

There is a French version, listed by MacEdward Leach, op. cit., p. x, which is 14 000 verses long. It contains so many additions to the friendship story that it cannot be regarded as a version of the Amicus and Amelius tale proper.
Könneker has commented on the apparent lack of balance between the friendship tale on the one hand and the love story on the other.\textsuperscript{24} She states that Konrad used a terse, concentrated style for the friendship story and that the narrative becomes broader and more leisurely in the love story. Our table suggests that this is only partly correct. In comparison with the three other versions of the friendship tale, Konrad starts the composition of \textit{Engelhard} on a broad basis and then becomes increasingly laconic towards the end. The first three groups of motifs in \textit{Engelhard} take up 69.6\% of the whole narrative, while in \textit{Amis} and \textit{Amiloun} they take up 45.5\%, in \textit{Amis e Amilun} 41.9\%, and in Hans von Bühel's \textit{Diocletianus Leben} 46.8\%. In groups four to eight, on the other hand, Konrad generally uses appreciably less space than any of the other versions in the table.

There is also evidence within \textit{Engelhard} to support the view that Konrad abandons the broad, expansive style towards the end of his poem. For example, Konrad treats the journey which one friend makes to seek the other's

\textsuperscript{24} For a discussion of Könneker's views, cf. pp. 13-17, above.
help quite differently in the first and in the second friendship test.

In the first friendship test, this journey (of Engelhard to Dieterich) is narrated in some detail. Once Engelhard has decided to go and see Dieterich, he goes to king Fruote to ask leave (4151 - 4192). This is granted and Engelhard rides to Dieterich's castle (4193 - 4229). Konrad then uses 56 verses (4230 - 4285) to describe how Engelhard, with the watchman as an intermediary, rouses Dieterich. The total length of the narration from the point where Engelhard decides to go, to the point where his conversation with Dieterich begins is 135 verses.

In the second friendship test, the description of Dieterich's journey is much shorter. There is no leave-taking. Konrad gives no details about how Dieterich obtains a ship (5670). There is no mention of a retinue although, as soon as he arrives, Dieterich sends 'den boten sin gereite' (5681) to Engelhard. The total length of the narration of this journey is only 43 verses (5667-5709).

It could be argued that this shorter description of the second journey may be due to the weight Konrad gives to his characters in the tale, that he is more concerned with Engelhard throughout the poem and that he would
describe Engelhard's journey at greater length than Dieterich's. However, Konrad's description of Dieterich's illness, or of the island on which he lives when he is ill, are very full, and there is a parallel case to Engelhard's conversation with a minor figure (the watchman) in Dieterich's conversation with the messenger when he is recalled from Fruote's court (1318 - 1373).

Konrad's use of minor figures, such as the watchman and the messenger, is another indication that he abandons the broad style towards the end of his poem. Konrad uses direct speech to give in detail the advice which Engelhard's father gives to his departing son (338-375), or Engelhard's conversation with the first person who offers his friendship (402 - 425). We also find, in the early parts of Engelhard, conversations between two minor characters, such as the messenger and the courtier at Fruote's court (1272 - 1309).

Once Engelhard and Engeltrüt are married, Konrad restricts himself to the main characters, Engelhard and Dieterich. Apart from the announcement of the angel (5443 - 5477) the only conversations which Konrad records in direct speech and in detail are those between Engelhard and Dieterich. Engeltrüt, who played a major rôle in the earlier parts of the tale, is relegated to the background.
Her question regarding the separating sword (and Engelhard's answer) is in reported speech (5090-5095). In the second friendship test, Engeltrût is simply 'diu küneginne' (6244) and her figure is used only to indicate that her absence makes it possible for Engelhard to kill his children. In all other versions used in my comparison (none of which place as much stress on the love story), there is a conversation between the friend (who has killed his children) and his wife (in which she agrees with his action).

Könneker is therefore right in suggesting that in Engelhard we find both the expansive style which she considers to be characteristic of the MHG verse novel, and the concentrated style representative, in her view, of the MHG short epic. In my view, however, her thesis that only the friendship story shows economy of style, while the love story alone is narrated in the more expansive style, is an oversimplification. The parting scene of the two friends (1379 - 1591) or the confrontation between Engelhard and Ritschier before the king (3671 - 4121), to mention just two instances, are not directly concerned with the love story as such, and yet they could not be considered as examples of the economy of narration which Könneker considers to be
characteristic of the friendship story in *Engelhard*.

Both Rupp and Könneker attempted to find symmetrical patterns of composition embracing the whole of *Engelhard*. The structural analysis which follows is an attempt to approach *Engelhard* as a series of connected short tales rather than as a unified whole. There are two reasons for proceeding this way. Firstly, it has been shown that Konrad used carefully calculated schemes of composition in the writing of his shorter works. Secondly, the observation has been made (particularly with reference to the *Trojanerkrieg*) that Konrad appears to see the parts of a longer tale as 'tales' in their own right.

25 Cf. my discussion of their findings above, pp. 11-17.


It would therefore appear reasonable to assume that if Konrad did calculate the space to be allotted to the narration of various sections of Engelhard, he would have planned individual sections of the poem rather than the poem as a whole.

One of the major obstacles to an analysis of Konrad's scheme of composition in Engelhard is the tradition of the text. There are no MSS extant, only a print of the year 1573 which is an adaptation of Konrad's text into 16th century High German. Since the printer took obvious liberties with the language, there is no guarantee that he did not take further liberties with the arrangement of the text. He may well have left out some passages or added some of his own. Furthermore, we do

deutlich, dass Konrad überlegt mit den verschiedenen Handlungssträngen arbeitet und unter maere einen Zusammenhang von Einzelgeschehnissen innerhalb des Ganzen verstehen kann.'

not know how reliable the MS was from which he worked. My analysis rests on the assumption that broad principles of arrangement are still discernible, even though the text may be unreliable in some places.

The plot of Engelhard appears to fall into four major sections:

I. Engelhard and Dieterich's meeting. Their journey to Fruote and their service there until Dieterich is recalled. (217 - 1628)

II. The love-story between Engelhard and Engeltrüt, their betrayal and Engelhard's imprisonment. (1629 - 3670)

III. The first friendship test. Dieterich fights the judicial combat on Engelhard's behalf. (3671 - 5134)

IV. The second friendship test. Engelhard kills his children to heal the leprous Dieterich. (5135 - 6504)

Each of these sections contains a symmetrical pattern of arrangement. Section I may be divided into smaller components as follows:
217 - 390 = 174  Engelhard. His decision to go abroad.

391 - 564 = 174  The apple tests. Dieterich passes.

565 - 746 = 182  Trip to Fruote. Welcome at his court.


---

c) 923 - 1288 = 366  Engeltrüt's dilemma. Choice of Engelhard. The messenger.

---

d) 1289 - 1628 = 340  Dieterich summoned home. The parting of the friends.

This Section is thus constructed on a symmetrical pattern. The four segments a), b), c), and d) are of roughly equal length, while a) + b) and c) + d) form two halves which are precisely equal (706 verses).

Segments a) and b) can again be divided into components of approximately equal length (174 verses + 174 verses and 182 verses + 176 verses).

Yet a further subdivision is possible. The first half of a) contains at its centre a monologue by Engelhard in which he considers his position. He realizes that without money he cannot live as a knight, and that his parents cannot provide him with the money he needs. It is exactly halfway through this monologue of 32 verses that Engelhard realizes that he must take the
initiative himself: 304 'ich muoz begân sus etewaz'.
Thus Engelhard's decision to leave his home is placed
in the centre of the first half of a), dividing this
half into equal parts of 87 verses.

It will be seen that, in this arrangement, each
major segment contains a 'linking' passage to the next
segment:

a) Engelhard. His decision to go abroad. The apple tests.

Dieterich passes (533 - 564)

b) The trip to Fruote. Welcome at his court. The friends
at court.

Engeltrût (852 - 922)

c) Engeltrût's dilemma. Choice of Engelhard.

The messenger (1268 - 1288)

d) Dieterich summoned home. The parting of the friends.

Section II contains the love-story. In order to win
Engeltrût's love, Engelhard must fulfill two conditions:
he must be dubbed a knight and he must take part in a
tournament. These two events are found precisely at the centre of this Section as follows:

a) $1629 - 2021 = 393$

b) $2022 - 2406 = 385$
   Engelhard confesses his love and is rejected. His love sickness. Engeltrût relents and confesses her love. Engeltrût's promise.

x) $2407 - 2892 = 486$
   Engelhard's investiture and the tournament in Normandy.

c) $2893 - 3285 = 393$
   The lovers meet in the orchard and are discovered by Ritschier.

 d) $3286 - 3670 = 385$
   The lovers part. Ritschier betrays their secret. Engelhard is imprisoned.

Once again, the pattern is symmetrical. The love-story is divided into two parts of equal length (778 verses) by the description of Engelhard's investiture and his visit to the tournament in Normandy. While Section I contained 706 + 706 verses, Section II contains 778 + 778 verses, separated by a segment of 486 verses. Once again, the two equal segments can be halved so that the love-story falls into four segments of approximately equal length.

The four segments a) b) c) and d) correspond to the four stages which Konrad describes in the love relationship between Engelhard and Engeltrût. Section a) describes the
approach of the lovers to each other. Both betray their feelings, but do not express them directly. Thus Engeltrüt's 'klagendiu swære' (1802) is misinterpreted by Fruote. Her hints to Engelhard, however, find their mark.²⁹ Engelhard's reply is also indirect, by glances (1900 - 1911) and by the table incident (1966 - 1987). Even the conversation between the lovers about the table incident remains at first on a seemingly innocuous level, in that Engeltrüt simply mentions Engelhard's 'symptoms' (1998 - 2021).

The second stage in the love relationship is reached in this conversation about the table incident, at the point where Engelhard (under considerable pressure from Engeltrüt) actually confesses his love to her. (2022 - 2074). The issue is now clear as far as the lovers are concerned: Engelhard desires the love of Engeltrüt, she refuses him at first, but finally relents upon seeing his plight. This stage in the relationship opens with

²⁹ 1894 daz wort begunde er zuo ðer frist merken üf ir hôhe gunst.
in lêrte sînes herzen kunst daz er dâ solte kiesen bî daz si niht wære minne frî in ir muote wider in.
Engelhard's confession of love to Engeltrût, and it ends with Engeltrût's confession of love for Engelhard. (2327-2379)

The third stage is reached in segment c). Engelhard has fulfilled the conditions laid down by Engeltrût. The lovers' promises to each other are consummated. Words are no longer necessary. Apart from a short conversation in which the lovers make their assignation, Konrad narrates this stage exclusively by the description of Engeltrût, the setting, and the love-play. It is at the end of this stage that the lovers are discovered, and this discovery by Ritschier introduces the fourth and final stage.

The final stage (segment d)) shows the lovers, now united, facing a threat to their relationship and to Engelhard's life (3373 - 3379). While the movement in the first three stages had been towards each other, it is now away from each other, but the bond which has been forged between them transcends the separation:

3458    ez ist noch der geloube min,
         swer dô gespalten hæte enzwei
         ir beider herzen als ein ei,
         ez wære bí den stunden
         in iegelichem funden
The 'linking passages' observed in Section I are also found in this Section:

a) Engeltrüt in love with Engelhard. Her mother dies. Engelhard appointed chamberlain. The table incident.

\[ \text{Engeltrüt's question} (1996 - 2021) \]

\[ \downarrow \]

b) Engelhard confesses his love and is rejected. His love sickness. Engeltrüt relents and confesses her love.

\[ \text{Engeltrüt's promise} (2327 - 2406) \]

\[ \downarrow \]

c) The lovers meet in the orchard and are discovered by Ritschier (3246 - 3285)

\[ \downarrow \]

d) The lovers part. Ritschier betrays their secret.

Engelhard is imprisoned.
The same pattern of composition as that found in Section I may be seen in Section III:

a) \(3671 - 4038 = 368\)  
   Engelhard is brought before the king. The accusation is made and Engelhard defends himself. Ritschier suggests trial by combat.  
   744

b) \(4039 - 4414 = 376\)  
   Engelhard agrees to fight. He travels to Dieterich. They converse and Dieterich offers to risk his life for Engelhard.  
   744

c) \(4415 - 4794 = 380\)  
   Engelhard reveals his problem to Dieterich. They exchange clothes and Dieterich goes to Fruote's court. The judicial combat begins.  
   720

d) \(4795 - 5134 = 340\)  
   The judicial combat. Dieterich wins. The consequences for Engelhard.

The Section thus may be divided into two halves of approximately equal length. The arrangement of this section is not exactly symmetrical, in that the first half is slightly longer than the second half. The quarter sections a) b) c) and d) also show greater discrepancies of length compared to those in Sections I and II. Nevertheless, the arrangement of this Section appears to be consistent with the pattern in Section I.

Segment a) describes the judicial hearing in which
Ritschier accuses Engelhard formally of having dishonoured Fruote's daughter. Engelhard denies the charge and the proceedings reach a stalemate which Ritschier breaks with his offer of judicial combat.

Section b) opens with Engelhard's acceptance of this challenge. The focus now shifts away from Ritschier and his accusation to Engelhard and Dieterich. Whereas segment a) had been dominated by Engelhard's defence against Ritschier's accusation, which was 'falsch' and 'ungetriuwe' (3498/99), segment b) describes how Engelhard, by accepting the combat and thereby falling into need, rediscovers the 'triuwe' of Dieterich (4352 - 4355).

It is at this point, at the end of segment b), when the two friends have re-established their bond, that they are poised for the first friendship test. It is significant that this section ends with a speech by Dieterich in which he offers three times to risk his life for his friend (4389 - 4414). The next segment shows that Dieterich's promise was not empty.

Segment c), then, is the application of what Dieterich had promised. This segment does not end with the preparations for the combat, but with the approach to it. Konrad suddenly suspends the action (the two opponents are already galloping towards each other
4770 - 4783) to make a comment of his own and thereby to close this particular segment.

Segment d) describes the combat, its outcome, and the consequences for Engelhard.

Once again, the four segments are linked by 'linking passages':

a) Engelhard is brought before the king. The accusation is made and Engelhard defends himself.

Ritschier suggests trial by combat (4001-4038)

b) Engelhard agrees to fight. He travels to Dieterich. They converse.

Dieterich offers to risk his life for Engelhard (4389 - 4414)

c) Engelhard reveals his problem to Dieterich. They exchange clothes and Dieterich goes to Fruote's court.

The judicial combat begins (4760 - 4785)

d) The judicial combat. Dieterich wins. The consequences for Engelhard.

Section IV is built on the same pattern as Section I and Section III:
a) 5135 - 5480 = 346  Dieterich's illness and exile.  
705  
The visitation by the angel.

b) 5481 - 5839 = 359  Dieterich decides to go and seek 
refuge with Engelhard. His 
journey and reception in Denmark. 
Engelhard offers Dieterich his 
life and all his possessions.

c) 5840 - 6202 = 363  Dieterich reveals the angel's 
message to Engelhard and 
Engelhard decides to kill his 
children.

665  
d) 6203 - 6504 = 302  The cure, the miraculous 
survival of the children. 
Epilogue.

It will be noted that the second half of this 
Section is in even greater disproportion to the first 
half than the second half of Section III was to its first 
half. Indeed, if the four half Sections are viewed 
together it becomes apparent that there is a steady 
decrease in length:

III a) + b) = 744
III c) + d) = 720
IV a) + b) = 705
IV c) + d) = 665

This may be a further indication that Konrad 
abandons his broad, expansive style towards the end of 
Engelhard. 30

There are certain similarities in the arrangement of Section IV with the arrangement of Section III, which describes the first friendship test. As in Section III, the first half of Section IV closes with the offer of the healthy (in Section III innocent) friend to sacrifice all he has for the sake of his friend. While the problem for Engelhard in Section III becomes apparent only in segment III b), the problem and the cure for Dieterich are already clear by the end of segment IV a). However, the decision to seek help from the friend is made in both cases in the b) segment (III b) and IV b)). In both cases the friend in need travels to his companion to seek advice and comfort respectively, and the innocent (healthy) friend offers much more than that. Both segments III c) and IV c) contain the revelation of the specific needs of the friend who seeks help and the generous decision of his companion. Segments III d) and IV d), finally, contain the helping action and its consequences.

The discussion of Sections III and IV has raised the question of the relationship of the four sections

---

31 Similarities between the two friendship tests are discussed by Karl-Heinz Göttert, op. cit., pp. 140 f.
to each other. The foregoing discussion of the structure of Engelhard rests on the assumption that Konrad planned individual sections of the poem rather than the poem as a whole. The analysis of structural patterns has, I hope, partially proved my assumption. Symmetrical arrangement can be found within the sections, but not in the poem as a whole.

But there are further indications that Konrad composed Engelhard in sections rather than as a whole. For example, the sections are clearly marked either by a comment from Konrad or by a shift in narrative perspective. At the beginning of Section II, Konrad indicates that he is now leaving one strand of his tale and starting on another:

1629 Hie lâzen wir den guoten
und den vil hôchgemuoten
belîben unde sagen wie
sîn trûtgeselle dort begie
daz er ze hôhem lobe kam.

The division between Section II and Section III is marked by a shift in perspective. Engelhard has no active rôle in the last parts of Section II (3474-3670). He is the object of Ritschier's accusation (3474 - 3544), of Fruote's anger (3545 - 3586), of Engeltrût's prayer
(3592 - 3622), and of the councillor's advice (3640 - 3670). The new section introduces Engelhard as an active character again. Konrad re-introduces him, as it were, by giving us a short sketch of his attitude:

\[\begin{align*}
3674 & \quad \text{er hæte sich ðes wol bedâht} \\
& \quad \text{daz er sîn lougen vaste bütte.} \\
& \quad \text{swie gar sîn herze in leide sütte,} \\
& \quad \text{doch was sîn muot vil unverzaget.}
\end{align*}\]

This reminds us of the last scene in Section II in which Engelhard had an active rôle: the parting of the lovers, where Engelhard had stated: 'ich wil mîn lougen bieten' (3437). At the beginning of Section III, Engelhard is about to put into practice the intention which he announces to Engeltrût towards the end of Section II, before he is imprisoned.

Section IV is introduced by a short comment of Konrad's, 'Nû merket wie daz hûebe sich' (5135) which 'sets off' what is about to follow from the previous section.

Finally, a brief examination of some aspects of content in each section which have not been treated by me so far, will further corroborate my view that Konrad composed Engelhard in sections rather than as a whole. Such an examination will also show that these sections,
in addition to their own internal structure, contain some motifs which are not found (or not further developed) in the rest of the poem.

In Section I, Konrad develops the theme of the unity of the two friends to such a degree that, to some extent, the two individuals become one. He does this by emphasising on several occasions their identical appearance. Konrad stresses the miraculous nature of this coincidence:

\[
\begin{align*}
450 \quad & \text{si wären beide zwâre} \\
& \text{vil gar gelîch ein ander,} \\
& \text{wan eine forme vander} \\
& \text{an in beiden, swer si sach.} \\
& \text{got, aller sâelden übergach,} \\
& \text{der haete an in gewundert.}
\end{align*}
\]

When Engeltrût falls in love with both friends at the same time, Konrad once again underlines the miraculous aspect of this by the repetition of the word 'wunder':

---

32 Konrad refers to the identical appearance of the friends five times: 445 ff., 666 ff., 824 ff., 957 ff., 1296 ff..

33 Cf. also 480 ff., 672 ff., 838 ff.
962 ir spilendiu ougen unde ir muot
diu funden zwære beide
sô wünneclîche weide
an den zwein gesellen
daz diu Minne stellen
begunde an ir besunder
ein inneclîchez wunder.
ein wunder, mac ich sprechen wol:
wande iuch wunder nemen sol
des dinges daz an ir geschach.

In contrast to this description of the miraculous identical appearance of the friends in Section I stands the casual mention of this feature in Section III, where it enables Dieterich to fight the judicial combat on behalf of Engelhard (4479, 4491).

The 'unio' of the two friends is further underlined by Konrad's use of language associated with 'minne':

805 Si wären zallen stunden
zesêmene gebunden
mit hôher minnen stricke,
by apostrophes to God:

817 Jâ herre got vil tiure,
wie was sô rehte gehiure
ir triuwe und ir gesellekeit!
and by twin formulas: 'ir einic sin, ir einic leben' (983), 'Ir zweier muot, ir zweier sin' (1065). Furthermore, from the meeting of the friends to Dieterich's meeting with the messenger, neither of the friends speaks or acts as an individual. When the messenger asks at Fruote's court for Dieterich, the courtier replies:

1280 'ob ich ez rehte sagen kan,
guoter kneht, so vindestu
bi dem werden kunege nu
zwene knaben lobelich.
der heizet einer Dieterich
und der andrer Engelhart.

The messenger asks for one person, the courtier refers him to both friends together.

Section I thus develops the theme of the meeting of the two friends, their 'unio' and their parting. It is the relationship as such which is important and it is such a close relationship that the friends lose their own identities in it. Even Engeltrüt's choice of a lover is subservient to the relationship between the friends: her dilemma is the direct result of their complete identification with each other.

In Section II, Konrad once again describes the meeting, union and parting of two partners: Engelhard
and Engeltrüt. To do this, he must first re-establish Engelhard as an individual figure. Konrad does this by the use of contrast. In the opening verses of Section II, Konrad contrasts the situation before Dieterich's departure with the situation after the departure (1634 - 1661). Ritschier, who is introduced after this passage, is a negative contrast figure. Whereas Engelhard is 'der êren querder/ und lobes gar ein angel' (1656/57), Ritschier is 'der tugentlûse wiht' (1694).

Konrad re-states in Section II Engelhard's social accomplishments in almost the same words as those used to describe the accomplishments of the two friends in Section I: 747

Swâ mite ein man ûf erden
ze hove liep sol werden, der kan dir alle swære
daz kunden si wol triiben. mit freuden gar vertriben.
lesen unde schriben lesen unde schriben,
sach man si beide schöne. harpfen unde singen,
in süezer stimme dône tanzen unde springen,
seitens unde sungen. kan er üzer mâzen wol.
si tanzten unde sprungen.
si schuzzen och ze deme zil.
schâchzabel unde seitenspil kanens üzer mâzen wol.
Section II is also the only section in which Engeltrüt plays a major rôle. Her function in Section I is subsidiary to the friendship theme.\textsuperscript{34} Once she has resolved her dilemma by choosing Engelhard, her part in Section I is over and we do not hear of her again until Section II.

At the beginning of Section III, Konrad once again has to re-establish Engelhard as an active character. The shift in perspective which marks the beginning of this section has already been discussed.\textsuperscript{35}

In Section III, Konrad picks up the thread again which he had dropped at the end of Section I: the theme of friendship between Engelhard and Dieterich. However, in Section III the emphasis is on the testing of the friends' relationship rather than on the relationship itself. Konrad evokes the 'unio' theme again in the first part of the conversation between Engelhard and Dieterich, particularly in Dieterich's first speech (4309 - 4348) where certain echoes of his parting speech at the end of Section I are found:

\textsuperscript{34} Cf. p. 49, above.

\textsuperscript{35} Cf. p. 45, above.
dâ von ich, trûtgeselle, dich nû kan ich miner jâre frist
vil sêre und inneliche man mit sâlde alrêrst vertrîben,
daz dû mit mir kêrest dan sit daz dû muost belîben
wider heim ze lande nû. gewaltic alles des ich hân.
vil sâelic friunt, dâ würdest dir sol hie werden undertân
dû min lîp, min guot, min êre.
gewaltic alles daz ich hân. dar über soldtû sêre
ich sol dir machen undertân gebieten swie dû selbe wilt.
lîp unde guot, die beide.
vil gar ân underscheide
solt dû gebieten über die.'

But now the relationship is put to a test, and the last (and only) differences between the friends disappear. The friends had not been identical in three respects: They had different names (Engeltrût's dilemma has drawn attention to this), they had different family backgrounds (Dieterich is Engelhard's social superior, and this had indirectly brought about their first parting), and their standing at Fruote's court is

36 Dieterich must leave Fruote's court because of his family responsibilities and Engelhard decides to stay because of his poverty. (Cf. the conversation of the friends when they part 1402 - 1585).
differentiated once Dieterich has left.

These differences are now cancelled out by the temporary exchange of clothes, names, family and position. Konrad emphasizes this change which takes place, and he points to the fact that it is not only the clothes which they exchange. Konrad introduces the changing of the clothes with the words: 'sich huop ein wehsel von in zwein/ unde ein wandelunge.' (4550/51), and later he again refers to the change in identity and position. With regard to Engelhard he says:

4580  der süeze wandelunge frî
      lebte dâ ze hove alsô
      daz man gesworen hæte dô
      daz der vil triuwebære
      wirt dâ ze hove wære.

and with regard to Dieterich:

4592  Dieterich reit allez hin
      in Engelhartes bilde.
      im wart sîn name wilde
      und fremde gar sîn heimuot.

In this way, the 'unio' theme reaches a new climax. Whereas in Section I it was a merging of the identities of Engelhard and Dieterich, in Section III it is a change of identity - in the test each friend assumes the
identity of the other. When Dieterich receives Engeltrût as a wife after the judicial combat, he 'is' Engelhard, not only in the eyes of the court, but also in terms of their relationship. Konrad points to this when he makes Fruote say:

4934  ich sol dich üf der erden
  ergetzen daz dü hast gestritten
  und grözen kumber hast erliten
  von lügelichen mären.
  ich wil an dir bewären
  daz ich dienest lônen kan'.

These words echo the sentiments expressed by Engelhard (whose expectations admittedly were more modest):

1532  mâns herren lônes nîme ich war
  den er mir hät geheizen.

Fruote's words also echo the promise of Engeltrût to Engelhard:

2371  ich troëste dich in kurzen tagen.
  dü solt nâch dienste lôn bejagen,
  nâch sorgen trôst erwerben.

Konrad carries the 'unio' theme right to the end of Section III. In the last passage of this section which refers to the friendship test, when Konrad recounts the question of the friends' wives regarding the separating
sword, he reports the reply of the friends together, even though they are geographically separated:

5104 si wurden beide bî der zît
von herzen freudebære
und seiten dô ze maere
den hôchgelobten wîben
wie von ir zweier lîben
diu wandelunge was geschehen
und wie der ander was gesehen
vil schöne für den einen.

It is only in the final few verses of Section III that Konrad prepares for the 'separation' of the friends: for the shift of attention to Dieterich as an individual (and not as an image of Engelhard):

5129 diu sældê bôt im liebes wal
sunder mâze und âne zal:
dâ wider sîn geselle
gewan daz ungevelle
daz er von hôher wcrdekeit
in swær'en kumber wart geleit.

If Konrad had to re-establish Engelhard as an individual at the beginning of Section II, he now does the same for Dieterich at the beginning of Section IV. Dieterich, at the beginning of this section, is shown in
the context of his court which reacts to his illness (5176 - 5199). Dieterich is not only placed in his social environment, but also into an elaborate nature setting (5226 - 5251, 5309 - 5359). For the first time in the poem (with the exception of the scene with the messenger 1326 - 1401) Dieterich is portrayed as an individual in his own right, with his own setting, independent of Engelhard. Dieterich's long monologues (5360 - 5416, 5490 - 5548) further establish Dieterich as an independent figure with its own motivation.

The 'unio' theme, which had reached a second climax with the friendship test in Section III, was based on a 'wunder', a miracle performed by God.\(^\text{37}\) Konrad now describes the second 'wunder': the miraculous healing of the leprous Dieterich and the survival of the children. He introduces the term at the point where the angel informs Dieterich of the cure for his disease:

\[
\begin{align*}
5426 & \quad \text{nû wolte got bi deme tage} \\
& \quad \text{ein wunder an im briuwen} \\
& \quad \text{und wolte in sîner triuwen} \\
& \quad \text{lâzen dô geniezen},
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{37}\) Cf. p.47, above.
The angel's message is the second direct intervention of God in the poem. It is God who 'initiated' the meeting of the friends (487 - 491), now God initiates the second friendship test. Engelhard acts in response to the command of God:

6174 'enwolte niht der werde got
daz noch geschaehe ein wunder hie,
sin heilic engel wære nie
ze Dieter iche komen dort.'

Engelhard is capable of killing his children only because of a miracle (6212 - 6227). Dieterich's healing is a miracle (6331), and the children survive because of a miracle (6375 - 6389). By stressing the miraculous element, by making God an actor, as it were, in the second friendship test, Konrad surpasses the climax which he had reached in the first friendship test in Section III.

Engelhard, then, consists of four major sections, each with its own internal structure and with its own aspect of the friendship theme. The four sections are

38 It should be noted that God initiates the test, but not specifically the reason for it (Dieterich's leprosy). Cf. pp. 127 - 137, below.
held together, as has been observed by Peter Kesting and Karl-Heinz Göttert, by Konrad's intention to tell a tale 'von höhen triuwen' (153). This intention is reflected in each section. 'Triuwe' is the bond which unites the two friends and cuts across social class distinctions. 'Triuwe' is also the bond which unites Engelhard and Engeltrüt, and once again it transcends the difference in social rank. 'Triuwe' is put to the test, particularly in Section III, and is victorious, and in Section IV, God himself intervenes and makes possible the final test of 'triuwe'.


41 Cf. for example Dieterich's reply to Engelhard at their first parting, 1489 - 1503.

42 Cf. Engeltrüt, 2075 - 2079.
With the exception of the broad comparison on pp. 21 - 25, Konrad's Engelhard has so far been viewed in isolation. We now have to turn to the two major areas of literary tradition which have also found expression in this poem.

The first is the tradition of the friendship tale. One or several versions of it must have been Konrad's major source. An examination of the whole tradition is essential to find that branch of it to which Engelhard comes closest. Chapter II is therefore devoted entirely to an examination of the tradition of Amicus and Amelius.

The second area of tradition is that of Classical and Late Classical courtly literature. Konrad sees himself as heir to this tradition\(^\text{43}\) and Engelhard is written in praise of a courtly quality: 'triuwe'. The influence of courtly literary tradition will be the subject of chapter III.

After an examination of these two areas, a detailed comparison of Engelhard and the Amicus and Amelius tale will be possible. This will be attempted in chapter IV.

CHAPTER II

THE TRADITION OF AMICUS AND AMELIUS

The story of Amicus and Amelius was the most popular tale of friendship in medieval Europe. Versions of it are found in every major European language, and a large number of MSS have survived.

The tale of Amicus and Amelius differs from other tales of friendship in the nature of the tests which the two friends undergo in order to prove their loyalty to each other:

1) A fights and wins a judicial combat on behalf of B.  

---

1 The two friends are usually called Amicus and Amelius. But as this is not always the case (cf. Engelhard), and as in some versions the names are reversed, I have substituted letters.
2) B sacrifices his children to heal the leprous A with their blood.

All extant versions of the tale contain the following basic plot:

Two friends (A and B) who look alike, serve at the court of a king (or duke or emperor). A falls in love with the king's daughter, who grants him her love. The two lovers are betrayed, and a judicial combat is arranged between A and the traitor. As A is guilty and therefore bound to lose the combat, he makes an excuse and seeks the advice of B. A and B exchange clothes and their respective positions. B fights the battle in the guise of A and is victorious, while A represents B at his court and sleeps chastely with the latter's wife. The two friends change places again, and A marries the king's daughter. After a while, B becomes leprous. He is granted asylum at the court of A. B is healed from his leprosy by the blood of A's children, who are killed by their father. The children are miraculously restored to life.

This summary will serve to distinguish the Amicus and Amelius tale from related material. Any story which
does not contain all the motifs contained in the summary will be referred to as 'related tale'.

Questions concerning the origins and the tradition of the Amicus and Amelius tale have interested scholars for well over a century. The most exhaustive study is still that of MacEdward Leach in the introduction to his Edition of Amis and Amiloun.

Leach's list of MSS of the friendship tale is the basis for my amended and amplified list in Appendix A. Leach advances the theory that the versions of the Amicus and Amelius tale may be divided into two streams of tradition, which he calls the 'hagiographic' and the 'romantic'. While it is possible to classify the various versions of the friendship tale into streams of tradition, there appear to be three, not two major streams.

---

2 The research done has been analysed by Malvina Reynolds, 'The Tradition of Amis and Amiloun'. Diss., University of California, 1940, pp. 13 - 26, and by J. A. Asher, Amis et Amiles, an Exploratory Survey. Auckland, 1952.


4 Cf. pp. 206 - 222, below.
Leach does not make the differences between the hagiographic and the romantic tradition entirely clear. He gives two summaries, one representing the hagiographic, the other the romantic tradition of the tale, but he does not analyse the differences between them. Moreover, the summaries are of two specific versions and therefore not altogether representative. Before giving the summary of the romantic versions, Leach states that 'Each of the romantic versions is considerably different from the others in detail' (p. xiv), and yet he introduces the actual summary with the words: 'The fundamental story as it appears in the romantic versions is as follows'. (p. xiv) Leach then summarises the plot of the Middle English Amis and Amiloun, which is no more fundamental for the romantic tradition than any of the other romantic versions. As I shall show below, the differences between the versions in the romantic stream of tradition are so profound that no single summary can adequately delineate the romantic tradition as such.

Certain differences between Leach's summary of Amis and Amiloun and the plot of the hagiographic

---

5 Cf. pp. 70 - 76, below.
versions can be assessed from Leach's study, but not the fundamental traits which make a given version either romantic or hagiographic. As none of the investigators of the friendship tale after Leach has been directly concerned with the relationship between the traditions, their basic characteristics have never been analysed in detail. Such an analysis is necessary to determine to which stream of tradition Engelhard is most closely related.

My own evaluation of the streams of tradition takes as a starting point the summary of the basic plot (p. 61, above). The hagiographic tradition of the tale contains certain additions to this basic plot which makes it into a saint's legend. As Leach has pointed out, the basic story is neither Christian nor hagiographic. The specifically Christian elements are found in the following additions to the basic plot:

---

6 MacEdward Leach, op. cit., pp. xxviii and xxxx.

7 Most hagiographic versions contain all the following motifs. There are however some abbreviated versions in the hagiographic tradition which leave out some of the points listed here. (Cf. my list of MSS of
1. The story is set in the time of Pippinus, king of France.

2. The fathers of the two boys, without knowing of each other, decide to take them to Rome where they are to be baptised by the Pope. They meet on the way there and decide to travel together. The boys become such close friends that they will not sleep or eat unless they are together.

3. The children are baptised in Rome. The Pope gives them identical cups.

4. The wisdom of Amicus is praised. Some versions say he is as wise as Solomon.

5. Before the father of Amicus dies, he gives his son advice and exhorts him to lead an honourable life, as befits a knight.

6. After the death of the father of Amicus, the two friends set out to find one another. In their

---

the hagiographic group, Appendix A, nos. 21 - 43). If they contain more than half the number of motifs, I call them 'hagiographic', if they contain fewer than half, I designate them as 'influenced by the hagiographic tradition'.
quest, they both meet the same pilgrim, whom each asks as to the whereabouts of the other. As they look so alike, the pilgrim thinks that the same man has asked him twice. Soon after this incident they meet and go to serve the emperor Charlemagne.

7. Amicus leaves the imperial court to go and visit his wife, whom he had married during his search for Amelius.

8. The traitor tells Amelius that Amicus left the court because he had stolen the king's treasure.

9. Amicus is warned in a dream that his friend is in danger.

10. When Amelius is struck by leprosy, his evil wife casts him out, or treats him so badly that he decides to flee from her with two of his servants and his cup.

11. On the flight from his wife, Amelius is beaten by a number of his own people.

12. After Amelius has been healed, a demon casts his evil wife over a cliff.

13. The two friends meet their death together on a battlefield near Mortara in Lombardy, fighting for
the Christian cause.

14. They are buried in two churches in Mortara, but on the morning after the burial, their two tombs are united in one church.

These are the main hagiographic additions to the basic plot. As the Radulfus Tortarius version already contains some hagiographic elements, it must be assumed that the hagiographic tradition existed before 1090, the approximate date of this earliest known version of the friendship tale.

Because of its association with the *Historia Septem Sapientum Romae*, the second stream of tradition may also be described in terms of a number of motifs which distinguish it from all other versions of the friendship tale. As the *Historia* is a collection of tales, the story of *Amicus* and *Amelius* is woven into a larger framework. The plot of the *Historia* is briefly as follows:

-----

8 Cf. my list of MSS, Appendix A, no. 1 of the romantic group, p. 219, above. Radulfus Tortarius mentions Mortara as the place where the friends are buried and he also refers to Amicus being cast out by his wife.
An emperor's son, called Diocletianus in most versions, is falsely accused by his stepmother of having attempted to commit adultery with her. The teachers of the young man (the seven wise masters) defend him by telling a story each about the falsity of women. To each of the stories, the empress tells one in reply, defending herself. In the end, the prince himself tells a story. He is acquitted and the treacherous stepmother is punished. The story told by the prince contains the version of the Amicus and Amelius tale.

The following is a list of the main points in which the Historia tradition differs from the other traditions of the friendship tale. In this case, the points of difference are not simply additions to the basic plot, as they were with the hagiographic tradition. While the hagiographic tradition could be described in terms of the basic plot, with the addition of at least seven of the 14 motifs listed above, the Historia tradition makes some more fundamental changes, particularly in the arrangement of the material and in the emphasis given to certain motifs.

---

Since the Historia tradition is closer to the romantic than to the hagiographic versions,¹⁰ and since the romantic versions cannot be adequately summarised, a comparison of the Historia with the principal representatives of the romantic tradition will outline the main features of the Historia and at the same time such a comparison will throw some light on the romantic tradition. For this reason, a comparison is made of the Historia with the Middle English Amis and Amiloun (ME), the Anglo-Norman Amis e Amilun (AN), the Old French chanson Amis et Amiles (OP), the French prose version found in MS Lille 130 (FP), and the account by Radulfus Tortarius (RT).¹¹

¹⁰ MacEdward Leach, who lists the Historia among the romantic versions, comments: 'The story, except for details and colouring, is close to the romantic versions of Amis and Amiloun.' (Op. cit., p. x).

¹¹ The French miracle play is the only romantic version not included in this comparison, as it is close to the Old French chanson. The two Anglo-Norman versions AN,A and AN,B (cf. my list of MSS, Appendix A, p. 219, below) are designated AN, except where they differ.
1. The *Historia* account opens with only one friend who goes to the court of the emperor to improve his education. In *ME*, both friends are brought to the court by their fathers. In *AN*, the boys are already at the court when the tale begins. *OF* opens with the simultaneous birth of the boys (which is mentioned, but not described in *ME*), and their baptism in Rome (which is also a feature of the hagiographic versions). *Ep* agrees with *AN* at this point. *RT* describes the boys and then continues: 'Jam iuvenes isti petiere palatia regis/ Pictonum, Avernum Vuascoque servit huic'.

2. The names of the two friends are Alexander and Lodovicus in the *Historia*. In all other versions here compared, they are called Amicus and Amelius (or vernacular forms of these names).

3. While both boys look alike, in the *Historia* Alexander is stronger than Lodovicus, and Lodovicus is wiser than Alexander. In all
other versions, the two friends are equal in every respect.

4. In the Historia, one friend woos and wins the emperor's daughter on behalf of his love-sick companion with gifts of ever increasing value. In all the other versions here compared, the girl woos the man.

5. In the Historia, Alexander is still at court when Lodovicus falls in love with the emperor's daughter. In all the other versions here compared, the friend not involved in the love-story is absent.

6. In the Historia, Alexander has to leave the emperor's court because his father has died. He has to go and administer the lands he has inherited. When he explains this to the emperor, he says that he would rather forsake his inheritance than leave the court. The emperor expresses his regret about the situation but he insists that Alexander go. In ME and AN, the friend has to leave the court for the same reason, but he does not offer to stay behind. In OF, he leaves the court to go and visit his wife (as in the hagiographic versions), while in Ep he leaves to seek adventure. RT does not explain his absence.
7. In the Historia, the mourning of the court at the departure of Alexander is described. No such passage is found in any of the versions here compared.

8. The recognition-token in the Historia is a ring which Lodovicus gives to Alexander when they part. In ME, AN and Fp the friends exchange identical cups. In OF they are given identical cups by the Pope (as in the hagiographic versions). RT mentions no recognition-token.

9. In the Historia, the traitor is not introduced until the love-story has been fully developed. In ME, AN, OF and Fp, the traitor appears before the love-story. In RT, the love-story is mentioned in one sentence, immediately followed by the account of the betrayal.

10. In the Historia, the traitor arrives at the court after Alexander has left, and he is lodged in the same room as Lodovicus. In all other versions here compared, he is already at the court and does not sleep in the same room.

11. When the lovers have been betrayed, Lodovicus visits his lady and asks her advice. She tells him to go and ask his companion to fight for him. In all other versions here compared, except ME, the man himself thinks of his friend.
12. When Lodovicus asks Alexander to fight for him in the *Historia*, the latter is at first reluctant, because he is to be married on the day of the combat. Finally he consents. In *ME, AN, OF, Fp* and *RT*, it is the innocent friend who offers to fight for his companion. In all these versions, he is also already married. *RT* indicates that his wife was a 'bride'.

13. The story of the judicial combat is told quite simply and briefly in the *Historia*. In *ME, AN* and *OF*, the queen and her daughter have to stand surety for the guilty friend when he leaves the court. His companion arrives to do battle for him only just in time to save the ladies from being burned. This incident is not found in *Fp* and *RT*. In *Fp* a fire is lit and the emperor's daughter is placed beside it. She is to be burned, should her champion be defeated.

14. When the wife of Alexander asks him, upon his
return, why he had placed a sword between them (by which he can see that his friend has been faithful), he replies in the Historia that he had done it to test her. In ME he tells his wife the truth (i.e. that he had been absent and that his friend had slept with her). In AN and Fp he refuses his wife an explanation. In OF he replies that he had been ordered by the doctor not to touch her for a month. RT does not mention the episode.

15. In the Historia, the wife of Alexander falls in love with another knight. Together they conspire to kill Alexander with poison. The poison however only makes him leprous. In ME he becomes a leper because, by impersonating his friend at the combat, he was deceitful. In AN and OF, he becomes leprous because, by marrying the emperor's daughter on behalf of his friend after the judicial combat,
he committed bigamy.\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Fp} and \textit{RT} do not offer any explanation.

16. In the \textit{Historia}, the leprous Alexander is admitted into the king's (his friend's) presence, because he asks in the name of 'king Alexander'. The recognition-token (ring) is presented only after he has drunk from the king's cup. In all other versions here compared, the recognition-token is handed to a door-keeper or servant, who then tells his master that the leper outside has a cup identical with his. The beggar is only then called in and recognised.

17. The presence of Alexander at the court of Lodovicus is concealed from his queen in the \textit{Historia}. When Alexander is healed, he secretly leaves the court and then re-enters the town to make the queen

\textsuperscript{12} This explanation is not entirely convincing, as the marriage was not consummated. If Amelius did commit bigamy, Amicus would be living out of wedlock with the emperor's daughter. Amelius acts as proxy for Amicus without informing the bride or her parents.
believe that he had just arrived. She is then told at the meal-table what has happened. In every other version here compared, the queen either knows of the arrival of the leprous friend, or she is simply not mentioned at this point in the narrative. The stratagem of a second entry into the town is therefore not necessary.

Much research has been devoted to the entire Historia, but scholars dealing with the whole collection of tales understandably view the friendship story as only a small part of the whole work. Students of the Amicus and Amelius tale, on the other hand, consider the Historia version to be late and unimportant.

There can be no doubt that the Amicus and Amelius tale in the Historia is in fact a comparatively late treatment of the friendship story. This is suggested by internal evidence alone. The author of the Historia version makes several attempts to rationalise and motivate certain parts of the tale. For example, he makes one friend wise enough to go and ask his companion for help, while the other is strong enough to vanquish the traitor. He turns the primitive motif of the emperor's
daughter forcing one of the friends to make love to her (Potiphar's wife motif) into the tale of the love-sick knight.\textsuperscript{13} The love story which in itself has no further function in the plot of the basic tale than to provide the pretext for the first friendship test, is adapted by the writer of the Historia version, and becomes a further proof of friendship and loyalty between the two companions. The Historia account also contains certain embellishments of the plot which seem to indicate that this version is a relatively late development of the tale: the elaborate recognition scene, for instance, or the complicated stratagem by which the mother of the children is told of their sacrifice and survival.

The exact point in time, at which the tale of Amicus and Amelius was incorporated into the Historia is difficult to determine. The Historia is only one branch of the widespread Seven Sages material, and it is comparatively late. According to Gaston Paris, the Historia was compiled in the first half of the 14th century,

\textsuperscript{13} For a full discussion of this motif, cf. MacEdward Leach, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. lxxiii - lxxix.
probably ca. 1330.¹⁴

The source of the friendship tale found in the Historia is also unknown. The version in the Historia differs considerably—as has been shown—from the hagiographic tradition and also from the individual versions which are grouped under the heading 'romantic tradition'. Commentators on the sources of the Historia so far have confined themselves to general statements.¹⁵ As with Engelhard, the question of the source still remains open. Either the author of the Historia version drew from a source unknown to us, or he adapted a known source so freely that it can no longer be identified.

In the tradition of the Amicus and Amelius tale, then, three broad streams may be identified. Two streams, the hagiographic and the Historia stream, are unified, in

---


¹⁵ Cf. Killis Campbell, op. cit., p. cxii: 'In H, vaticinium appears in combination with amici, a very early /sic_7 version of Amis and Amiloun.'
that all versions of one stream share a certain number of motifs which are either additions or alterations to the basic plot. The romantic stream is not unified in that each version within this group contains some motifs in addition to the basic plot which may or may not be present in the other versions.

The three streams of tradition are represented in the versions of the *Amicus* and *Amelius* tale written in either High or Low German. An examination of these versions will show that there are no direct relationships between the only German representative of the romantic stream of tradition, *Engelhard*, and any of the other German versions of the friendship tale.¹⁶

---

¹⁶ Helmut de Boor has suggested that Kunz Kistener's *Jakobsbrüder* is a conscious adaptation by Kistener of Konrad's *Engelhard*. (Helmut de Boor und Richard Newald, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. München, 1964, III/1, 349 - 350). Karl-Heinz Göttert claims that the 'Gesamtkonzeption' of *Engelhard* is closer to the hagiographic than to the romantic versions. (Tugendbegriff und epische Struktur in höfischen
From my list of MSS in Appendix A, the following MSS are in German.\footnote{17}

1. MS Eichstätt N II No. 167 (No. 18)

A detailed description of this MS and its contents is given by Helmut Rosenfeld.\footnote{18} It appears that these two fragments, of 38 verses each, represent the only translation into High German of the full \textit{Vita} (as distinct from the abbreviated versions of the hagiographic group) known so far. Konrad's \textit{Engelhard} does not contain any of the 14 motifs characteristic of

\begin{quote}
\textit{Dichtungen}. Kölner Germanistische Arbeiten, vol. 5, Köln Wien, 1971, pp. 143 - 148). Göttert admittedly does not suggest that there is a direct relationship between \textit{Engelhard} and any other German version of the friendship tale. His remarks indicate, however, that he regards \textit{Engelhard} as part of the hagiographic stream of tradition in German.
\end{quote}

\footnote{17} The MS number of my list is given in brackets. Where no other indication is given, the versions are in High German.

the hagiographic tradition, listed on pp. 65 - 67, above.

2. The Poem by Andreas Kurzmann (No. 36)

Andreas Kurzmann, a cistercian monk from Neuberg (Styria), who died before 1428, re-narrates an abbreviated version of the Vita which must have been close to the version found in the Speculum Historiale by Vincentius Bellovacensis. When Anton Schönbach printed the Latin MS Graz 873 (No. 21 in my list of MSS), he mentioned the fact that it was almost identical with the Speculum version, and his notes indicate that the Kurzmann poem is close to both the Speculum and MS Graz 873.


My own investigations have led to the conclusion that Kurzmann's poem is closer to MS Graz 873 than to the Speculum. In three instances where the two Latin versions differ, Kurzmann follows MS Graz 873.21

As the exact original is not known, no specific comments can be made on Kurzmann's treatment of his source. It should be noted, however, that in the scene where the leprous Amicus is illtreated by his wife, Kurzmann states that she attempted to poison him. This motif is otherwise found only in the Historia tradition of the friendship tale.

The miracle of the tombs is missing in the Kurzmann version. As many of the abbreviated versions (e.g. most versions based on the Speculum and MS Graz) do not refer

21 Both MS Graz and Kurzmann mention that the cups given to the boys by the Pope are adorned with gold (Cf. Schönbach, op. cit., 851; Appendix C, p. 259, v. 58). The Speculum says simply that they were adorned. Both MS Graz and Kurzmann refer to the red beard of Ardericus (Schönbach, op. cit., 855; Appendix C, p. 273, v. 346). In both MS Graz and Kurzmann, only the traitor swears an oath before the judicial combat (Schönbach, op. cit., 858; Appendix C, p. 284, v. 587.)
to the miracle, it may be assumed that it was not described in Kurzmann's source.

The traces of a possible influence from the Historia (in the poisoning incident) would seem to indicate that either Kurzmann or the writer of his source may have known at least one non-hagiographic version of the Amicus and Amelius tale. It cannot have been Konrad's Engelhard, however, since Konrad does not refer to this poisoning attempt, and there are no similarities between Konrad's and Kurzmann's treatment of the friendship tale.

The text of the Kurzmann poem is to be found in Appendix C, pp. 253 - 311, below.

3. MS Berlin 4° 261 (No. 37)

This is a prose translation (in West Middle German) of the Speculum version. With the exception of a few small additions by the author, the translation follows its source closely.

In this version not only the miracle of the tombs, but also the description of the death of the friends is missing. A possible explanation is that the entry of the healed Amicus into his ancestral home Bericanus, which
forms the conclusion of this version, is at the end of book 166 of the Speculum. The death of the friends in the Speculum follows two books later, in book 169. Books 167 and 168 contain material which is not related to the friendship tale. It is probable that the translator assumed that the tale of Amicus and Amelius ended with book 166 in the Speculum.

The death of the friends and the miracle of the tombs are two motifs which are characteristic of the hagiographic stream of tradition. Like most romantic versions, Konrad does not describe these two incidents. Apart from this agreement between MS Berlin 261 and Engelhard (which is in my view coincidental), there appears to be no direct relationship between the two texts.

The text of this version is also to be found in Appendix C, pp. 312 - 331, below.

22 Cf. points 13 and 14, pp. 66 and 67, above.
4. MS Cgm 523 (No. 38)

This is a shortened version of the Latin Vita, written in the Swabian dialect. According to Schönbach and Reiffenstein, it is closely related to the Speculum. My own findings confirm this. On four occasions on which the Speculum and MS Graz 873 differ, MS Cgm 523 agrees with the Speculum version.

23 Anton Schönbach, op. cit., 850.


25 MS Cgm 523 shares two subheadings with the Speculum which are not found in MS Graz 873: 'Wie Amicus vnd Amelius einander sōchten vnd jn dem hoff Karoly an ein ander funden' (Cf. Schönbach, op. cit., 853, note 5) and 'Wie Amicus aussecezig ward vnd wie in Amelius schon enpfieng in sein hauss' (Cf. Schönbach, op. cit., 861, note 1). In MS Cgm 523, the pope's name is Deodato (Reiffenstein, op. cit., p. 241, l. 15) or Deodatus (Reiffenstein, op. cit., p. 247, l. 225). This name is also used in the Speculum. MS Graz 873 uses only the name Deusdedit (Cf. Schönbach, op. cit.,
Like MS Berlin 4° 261, this translation omits the material about the death of the friends found in book 169 of the Speculum. It includes, however, some motifs not found in any other known hagiographic version of the Amicus and Amelius tale. The following additions appear to be conscious attempts of the author to explain certain events and statements:

1. The traitor Ardericus is mentioned specifically as the guardian of the king's daughter.

2. Ardericus's statement that Amicus had escaped with the king's treasure is explained with the sentence: 'Wann er was alts ain böser man, daz er auff Amico argkwon hett, wie er dem künig das güt hett verstolen vnd dauon wär er geflohen.'

3. The famine in Rome is described as being so severe that Amicus is driven away.

---

851, note 4). Finally, the angel's message in which the cure for Amicus's leprosy is revealed is in reported speech in the Speculum and MS Cgm 523, while MS Graz 873 uses direct speech.

26 Reiffenstein, op. cit., p. 244, l. 121 - 123.

27 In most other hagiographic versions, the famine is
4. The churchbells, which ring of their own accord when Amelius takes the healed Amicus to church, summon the wife of Amelius to the place where the two friends are.\textsuperscript{28}

A further addition to this version is the statement that, after the judicial combat has been arranged, Amelius rides to his friend to seek help. In this point, MS Cgm 523 agrees with most romantic versions. In the hagiographic tradition, Amicus returns to the court before the combat and meets Amelius there. It is possible that Konrad's Engelhard may have influenced the writer of Cgm 523 in this point, but no further points of similarity between the two texts can be found.

5. Der grosse Seelentrost (No. 35)

In this Low-German exempla collection, the Amicus and Amelius tale is the fourth exemplum to the eighth commandment. This version is another adaptation from the described as so severe that fathers drive out their sons. Amicus decides to leave of his own accord.

\textsuperscript{28} In most other hagiographic versions, the people come running at the sound of the bells, and the encounter with the wife either takes place before this scene, or her presence is unexplained.
Speculum Historiale. The dependence of the Seelentrost version on the Speculum can be proved not only by a close comparison of the motif material in the two versions, but also by the fact that the author of the Seelentrost actually mentions the Speculum as one of his sources:

'Libellus iste collectus est de diversis libris: De bybblia, de passionali, de hystoria scolastica, de hystoria ecclesiastica, de speculo hystoriali, de decresis et decretalibus . . .' 29

The writer of the Seelentrost considerably shortens the account he found in his source. He omits the usual reference to the time of Pippinus which is generally found in the hagiographic versions. The wisdom of Amicus is not mentioned, and his father makes no speech to his son before he dies. Later in the story, when the leprous Amicus has to flee from his evil wife and arrives at Bericanus, he is not beaten by his own people as in the Speculum. Another episode which is left out by the author of the Seelentrost is the death of the two friends. The

miracle of the tombs, on the other hand, is told in a few sentences: 'Dar na storuen se beide vnde worden malk gegrauen sunderliken in sin graff. Do vel dat eyne graff in. Do grouen de lude dat graff vp vnde funden den licham dar nicht inne. Do grouen se dat andere graff vp, do funden se beide lichamme to samne.'

The author of the Seelentrost version also employs simplification to condense those elements in his source which could not be omitted. The motif in the source is stripped of all those elements which are not absolutely necessary for the action. An example of this is the scene where the leprous Amicus arrives at the court of Amelius. After the servant has told Amelius that the leper has a cup identical with the one in which Amelius had sent him wine from his table, the Speculum states: 'tunc comes infirmum ad se perduci fecit et interrogavit, unde esset vel qualiter illum cyphum acquisset. qui respondit, se Bericano castro oriundum fuisse et Rome a papa Deusdedit alias Deodato cyphum et nomen Amicum cum baptismate accepisse. statim ergo comes illum esse

30 Margarete Schmitt, op. cit., p. 233, l. 3.
socium suum cognovit, qui eum quondam a morte retraxerat et filiam regis uxorem suam sibi desponsaverat. projecit ergo se super illum clamans et flens eumque osculans et amplexans.'

In the Seelentrost, Amelius does not need to question Amicus. When he hears about the cup, he knows at once that it is his friend who is outside: 'Do sprank Amelius vp van der taflen vnđe sprak: "Dat is myn leue kumpan Amicus!" vnđe leip to der ðörre vnđe vel eme vmme den hals vnđe kuste ene vor synen munt vnđe weynede van leue . . . .'

No trace of any influence of Konrad's Engelhard can be found in this version.

6. MS Hannover I 239 (No. 36)

This is a slightly abbreviated version of the legend as it is found in the Seelentrost. It follows its source closely, sentence by sentence, summarising some of the conversations and leaving out some details. The text of this version is to be found in Appendix C, pp. 242-252.

7. The Anonymous Poem of 1352

This is a translation into High German of the Historia Of the three MSS of this poem, only the Hamburg Codex chart. Fol. Scr. 91c of 1454 has been preserved.

---

31 Margarete Schmitt, op. cit., p. 231, l. 28 ff.

32 The versions under Nos. 7 - 12 in this list are not
Adelbert von Keller's Edition of this poem is based on a MS from the Eschenburg library which is now lost.

This is the first of two translations of the Historia into High German verse. It has been the subject of a thorough investigation by Paul Paschke.

I have not been able to find evidence of a direct relationship between Engelhard and any of the translations of the Historia into German.

8. Hans von Bühel, Diocletianus Leben

This is the second translation of the Historia into High German verse, written in 1412. The earliest MS (though not the original) dates from the same year. It is in the University Library of Basel, No. 0. III. 14. Jakob Schmitz has shown that Hans von Bühel must have used MS Heidelberg Pal. germ. 106,8 as a source for his

found in Appendix A. This is because Appendix A does not list translations of the Historia (Nos. 7-9) or related tales (Nos. 10 - 12).


work. The friendship tale begins at verse 7591 and ends at 9079. With a few small exceptions, Hans von Bühel closely follows the text of his source.

9. The Prose Translations of the Historia

There are 11 known MSS which belong to three distinct traditions. The earliest MS is the Karlsruhe Codex Fap. Germ. LXXIV, of 1448.

The prose translations, all dating from the 15th century, became the basis for the printed versions, which must have been extremely popular. According to Joseph Klapper (Verfasserlexikon, III, 342), the German prose versions of the Historia were printed 57 times between 1470 and 1687.

To these nine versions, three further tales should be added. They are not versions of the Amicus and Amelius tradition as such, but contain many features identical with the friendship tradition and must be regarded as thematically related.

10. Die Jakobsbrüder

Several prose versions of this legend exist. One is printed by Franz Pfeiffer, another, so far unpublished, is found in MS Nürnberg, Germ. Nationalmuseum 16567, fol. 113\textsuperscript{r} - 129\textsuperscript{r}. Kunz Kistener's verse treatment of the legend is preserved in two MSS:


b) The Frankfurt fragments, Staatsarchiv Frankfurt. Late 14th or early 15th century.\textsuperscript{37}

Based on b) is a new version of the tale by Pamphilius Gengenbach, written ca. 1516.\textsuperscript{38}

This legend shares with the Amicus and Amelius tale only the second test of friendship: the healing of

\textsuperscript{36} 'Neue Predigtmärlein, No. 7', Altdöutsches Übungsbuch, ed. Franz Pfeiffer, Wien, 1866, pp. 197 - 199.


one friend by the blood of the other friend's children. The friends meet on a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Jacob. One of them dies and the other carries his corpse to the church, where it is revived by St. Jacob. The revived friend marries and, with the blood of his children, he heals his companion who has become leprous. Apart from its relationship with the tale of Amicus and Amelius by virtue of the second friendship test, this legend deserves mention because some versions of it contain the test of the three apples with which one friend discovers the other. 39 This test is not mentioned in any version of the Amicus and Amelius tale except in Konrad's Engelhard. 40

---

39 This test is found in the French versions (Cf. Jakob Ulrich, 'Drei romanische Fassungen der beiden Jakobsbrüder', Romanische Forschungen, XIX (1906), 595 - 632), and also in the German prose printed by Franz Pfeiffer, op. cit., but not in the poem by Kistener or in MS Nürnberg 16567.

40 Cf. pp. 116 - 117, below. Helmut de Boor's claim (op. cit., III/1, 549 - 550) that Kunz Kistener adapted Konrad's Engelhard and turned it into a saint's legend does not appear to be valid. A
11. Karlmeinet

This is a collection of tales, grouped around the life of Charlemagne, composed in the 14th century. The only complete MS of this collection is a paper codex of the Landesbibliothek Darmstadt, fol. No. 2290. 15th century. Several 14th century fragments exist. The Karlmeinet does not contain the friendship tale as such. It simply mentions the participation of Amicus and Amelius in the battle of Mortara, their death and the miracle of the tombs. According to Jan Akkerman, the Speculum Historiale furnished the source for this episode.

careful comparison of all known versions of the Jakobsbrüder legend (which is outside the scope of this study) may well show that Kistener was not the inventor of the legend, as de Boor seems to suggest. It appears more likely that the legend and Engelhard are based on a version of the Amicus and Amelius tale which may have contained the test of the three apples.

42 Studien zum Karlmeinet. Amsterdam, 1937.
Since the elements of the friendship tale found in the Karlmeinet are specifically hagiographic elements, no influence of Konrad's Engelhard may be traced.

12. Olivier und Artus

This is a translation of the French 'Volksbuch' Hystoire de Olivier de Castille et Arthur d'Algarbe, son loyal compagnon. The translation was made by Wilhelm Ziely of Bern in 1521. In this tale of friendship, only fragments of the Amicus and Amelius tale are retained, and they are almost unrecognisable. In typical 'Volksbuch' manner, the author is less concerned with the narration of a unified tale, than he is in packing as much adventure, pageantry and melodrama as possible into a loosely constructed framework.

The only elements of the Amicus and Amelius tale which remain in the 'Volksbuch' are a) the idea of friendship and the friendship troth, b) the recognition-token (here in its original form as life-token), c) the chaste sleeping of one friend with the other's wife, and d) one friend sacrificing his children for the sake of the other, with the miraculous survival of the children.

The author of the 'Volksbuch' does not appear to have used Konrad's Engelhard as one of his sources.
The German accounts of the Amicus and Amelius tale discussed above may be divided into the three streams of tradition of the friendship tale as follows:

1. The Hagiographic Group. To this group belong: MS Eichstätt N. II No. 167, the poem by Andreas Kurzmann, MS Berlin 4º 261, MS Cgm 523, Der große Seelentrost, and MS Hannover I 239. Apart from the Eichstätt fragments, all known German versions in this group go back either to a shortened redaction of the Vita similar to MS Graz 873, or to the Speculum Historiale.

2. The Romantic Group. The only representative of this stream of tradition is Konrad's Engelhard.

3. The Historia Group. Apart from the hagiographic texts listed above, all known German treatments of Amicus and Amelius, except Konrad's Engelhard, are based on the Historia. There appears to be no other non-hagiographic tradition of the friendship tale.

Apart from one isolated instance, there appears to be no evidence to suggest a direct relationship between Engelhard and any of the German versions of the friendship tale discussed above. Engelhard is unique

---

Cf. p. 87, above.
insofar as it is the only known romantic treatment of the Amicus and Amelius material in German.

This discussion of the Amicus and Amelius tradition in general and of the German versions in particular has shown that there are major variations between the various streams of tradition and even within these streams. The tradition of the friendship tale on which Konrad based his Engelhard is more complex than has been assumed by commentators who touch on the relationship between Engelhard and its sources. 44

The two major factors in the search for the source or sources of Engelhard: the poem itself and the tradition of Amicus and Amelius, have now been examined in some detail. I hope to have shown, in chapter I, that Konrad composed Engelhard as a series of four connected tales in praise of 'triuwe', a courtly quality. The examination of the Amicus and Amelius tradition has shown that Engelhard is the only treatment in German of the Amicus and Amelius material in the courtly tradition. Aspects of courtly literary tradition which influenced Konrad in the composition of Engelhard will be examined in the discussion of Konrad's secondary sources which now follows.

44 Cf. pp. 3 - 4, note 5, above.
CHAPTER III

THE SECONDARY SOURCES

On the basis of chapters I and II it is possible to isolate certain motifs in Engelhard which Konrad may have taken from secondary sources. I hope to show, however, that Konrad did not confine his borrowings to motifs, but that he also took over and adapted certain expressions and images from other writers. Works which Konrad could have known will therefore be examined not only for motif material, but also from the point of view of style.

Motifs supply important clues as to which works of earlier poets and contemporaries Konrad may have known. These clues are of particular importance, as Konrad names only three poets in his extant works. He expresses his admiration for Gottfried von
Strassburg in the Goldene Schmiede:¹

94 ich sitze auch nicht auf grünem kle
von süezer rede touwes naz,
da wîrêclîchen uffe saz
von Strazburc meister Gotfrid,
der als ein waecher houbetsmit
guldin getihte worhte.

Konrad also mentions Gottfried in the Herzmaere:²

8 des bringet uns gewisheit
von Strâzburc meister Gotfrit:
swer ûf der wären minne trit
wil eben setzen sînen fuoz,
daz er benamen hoeren muoz
sagen unde singen
von herzeclichen dingen,
diu ê wären den geschehen
die sich dâ hæten undersehen
mit minneclîchen ougen.

The second poet named by Konrad is der Meissner, a 'Spruchdichter' who may have been his contemporary.\(^3\)

The third poet whom Konrad names is Wirnt von Gravenberg. In Der Welt Lohn,\(^4\) Dame World appears to Wirnt, who is portrayed as the example of the worldly knight.

There appears to have been no direct influence on Engelhard of der Meissner or Wirnt, though Gottfried has in fact influenced Konrad. (Cf. pp. 147 - 149, below).

Other references by Konrad to earlier poets are in general terms, as in the following extract from Partonopier:\(^5\)

---

\(^3\) Cf. Elisabeth Karg-Gasterstäd, Verfasserlexikon,III, 349. Konrad's poem on der Meissner (Kleinere Dichtungen Konrads von Würzburg, ed. Edward Schröder. Berlin, 1926, III, 65) begins with high praise, and Karg-Gasterstäd calls it 'rühmend'. The last three lines however make it clear that the praise is in fact ironic: 'man sol ze síñem sange üf einem messetage vîren./ "alsus kan ich lîren",/ spruch einer der von Ecken sanc.'


gesprochen und gesungen
die meister hânt sô rehte wol,
daz man guot bilde nemen sol
an ir getihnte schoene.

The question arises whether the search for Engelhard's secondary sources must be extended to include not only German, but also French writings. Until quite recently, it was generally accepted that Konrad learned French late in his life. Eduard Hartl states: 'Erst spät (in seinem 5. oder 6. Lebensjahrzehnt) lernt er Französisch'. A similar statement is found in Ehrismann's Literaturgeschichte: 'Spät noch lernte er Französisch'. On the other hand, de Boor claims more recently that Konrad never knew French. Writing about partonopier und Meliur, he makes the following comment: '... und hier stossen wir auf die Grenzen von Konrads Bildung. Beherrschte er das gelehnte Latein, so war ihm das höfische Französisch fremd; er brauchte den in dem

6 Verfasserlexikon, II, 928.

Gedicht genannten Heinrich Marschant als Dolmetscher, um sich seine Quelle, den Partonopeus de Blois des Denis Piramus, verdeutschen zu lassen. 8

A third view is advanced by Wolfgang Monecke. 9 Monecke claims that Konrad's statement 'franzeis ich niht vernemen kan' (Partonopier, 212) should be interpreted as a polite hyperbole which Konrad uses to acknowledge the services of Heinrich Marschant, his helper.

All these statements are based on the fact that Konrad names an interpreter for his Partonopier und Meliur, but not for the later Trojanerkrieg, which is also based on a French source. However, no final conclusion may be drawn with certainty on the available evidence.

In view of the fact that Konrad used French works as principal source material for at least two of his poems, it is entirely possible that he may have utilised French

8 Helmut de Boor und Richard Newald, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. München, 1964, III/1, 35.

writings either directly or indirectly in the composition of Engelhard.

We now turn from the specific information which Konrad gives about other poets, to the clues within Engelhard which point to secondary sources. Some of these clues may be found in those motifs in Engelhard which are not found in any other version of the Amicus and Amelius tradition. There are three possible explanations for the presence of any such motif in Engelhard:
a) Konrad may have invented it, b) Konrad may have found it in a secondary source and either consciously or unconsciously incorporated it into Engelhard, c) the motif may have been added to the friendship tale by the writer(s) of Konrad's primary source or sources.

The following nine motifs, none of which are found in any known versions of the Amicus and Amelius tale, may be isolated in Engelhard: 10

10 Motifs which Konrad appears to have amplified (mainly by adding detail, cf. p. 146, below), are not included in this list. (E.g. the friends' parting scene 1379 - 1591, or the court scene 3671 - 4121, which are narrated more briefly in all other versions of the friendship tale).
1. The Reason for Engelhard's Departure from his Parental Home.

286  dar umbe er tougenliche
also gedâhte wider sich.
'sich, got herre, wie sol ich
gedienen werden liute gruoz?
ich wæne, an mir verderben muoz
ritters name und ouch sîn amt.
ich fürhte, ich müeze ir beider samt
ledic unde blôz gestân,
swenn ich des geldes niht mac hân
dâ mite ich mir gewinnen müge
lop daz mînen êren tûge
die von geburt mich erbent an.
wân swaz mîn vater geldes kan
geleisten und diu muoter mîn,
des dürfens unde ir kindelin
âne mich ze rehter nôt.
wân zwâre, ich wolte ê liegen tôt
ê dan daz ich in næme daz.
ich muoz begân sus etewaz:
daz wil ich niht langer sparn.
ich sol ze fremden landen varn
biz daz ich den ersuoche
der min ze knehte ruoche.

Engelhard's journey to the court of Fruote seems
to be motivated by three factors:

1. A knight without worldly goods is not fully
accepted by his society.

2. Engelhard's parents are unable to provide for
him.

3. It is therefore necessary for him to go abroad
in the hope that he will be able to make his fortune.

All three motifs are found elsewhere in Classical
or Late Classical MHG literature.

Konrad stresses that a knight, however perfect he
may be, needs material wealth to be fully accepted.
Before the monologue, quoted above, in which Engelhard
considers his situation, Konrad remarks:

269     Wan zwäre, als ich erkennen kan,
sô mac vil kûme ein edel man
wert gesîn in kranker habe.
an hôher wirde gât im abe,
swenn er geldes niht enhât.
als ez nû in der werlde stât,
sô darf ein man wol guotes
der edeles herzen muotes
wil pflegen unde spulgen.
daz silber in den bulgen
dringet für die höhen tugent.

The idea that a knight without worldly goods is not fully accepted by his society or, more generally, that money is valued more highly than accomplishments and virtue, is expressed by Thomasin von Zerklære: ¹¹


Der Marner touches on the same subject in a 'Spruch': ¹²

Finally Meister Boppe, a contemporary of Konrad's, expresses the same thoughts in one of his stanzas:

Ob in vünf landen ûz erwünschet wäre ein helt, des lîbes schoene, in ganzen tugenden ûz erwelt, getriuwe, milte, stâete in sînen worten; Er künde schriben lesen tihten seiten spil, birsen jagen schirmen schiezen zuo dem zil und wäre er guot in wâfen zallen orten: Künde er mit behendikeit diu swarzen buoch, ochu kunst der grâmacien, und wäre in sînen wol bereit ze döen singen alle stampenien und wurfe er den blîden stein wol zwelf schouch lanc vor allen sînen sellen, dü mite er quæme des enein daz er ein wilden beren künde vellen, und alle vrouwen teilt im ir gruoz ze hîhem dinge, hæt er der siben kûnste hort,

wis unde wort,
daz waer vil gar an im verlorn und heete er niht pfenninge.

The second motif, parents being unable to provide for their sons, is treated by Herger: 15

Ich sage iu, lieben sune min,
iu enwaehst korn noch der wîn,
ich enkän iu niht gezeigen
diu lêhen noch diu eigen.
mu genâde got der guote,
und gebe iu sâelde unde heil.

vil wol gelanc von Tenemarke Fruote.

Herger not only treats the theme of parents being unable to provide for their children, he also refers to king fruote of Denmark. He writes, however, from the perspective of an itinerant singer; his sons are not provided for at

In view of the arguments put forward by Simrock, and de Boor, op cit., II, 395, I am using the name Herger rather than Spervogel.
all. With them it is therefore not a case of going to a court to improve their education and their standing, as it is with Engelhard: it is their very livelihood which is at stake.

Engelhard's intention is to go to the court of Fruote as a 'knappe', in the hope that, after he has served loyally for some time, he will be dubbed a knight and given a fief. While poverty is the immediate reason for his journey to Fruote, Engelhard's sojourn there must also be interpreted against the background of the medieval tradition whereby a young nobleman would spend some time at the court of a knight of renown, and would receive his instruction there. ¹⁶ This custom is reflected for example in Wigalois and in Eilhart's Tristram, where the heroes leave their homes to be educated abroad. Parzival's sojourn at the court of Gurnemanz is also in this tradition.

While individual motifs may thus be traced back to works of Konrad's predecessors and contemporaries, I have been unable to find a precedent for the three combined

---

motifs which determine Engelherd's departure. These motifs are found, however, in a French narrative poem by Philippe de Remi, a younger contemporary of Konrad's. In the prologue to his *Jehan et Blonde*, Philippe writes:

9

```
Tex hom demeure a son hostel
Qui a grant paines a du sel,
Que, s'il aloit en autre tere,
Il savroit assés pour aquerre
Honneur et amis et richece.
Et ki ce pert par sa perece,
Il en doit estre mains prisies
```

---


18 Hermann Suchier, *op. cit.*, II, 3 - 4.
Et des preudomes desprisés.
Vous avez maint homme veu,
S'il ne se fussent esmeu
Hors de leur lieu, que ja ne fussent
Si honéré ne tant n'eussent
De sens, de richesse, d'avoir;
Car cascuns mostre son savoir
Miex en autre païs qu'el sien
Et plus tost en vient a grant bien.
Quant povres jenticx hom demeure
En son païs une seule heure,
On li devroit les iex crever;
Car il ne fait fors que grever
Lui et tous ses parens qui l'aiment,
Et li autre caitif le claiement
Et eskieuent sa compagnie.
Li hom qui demeure en tel vie
Est d'oneur squerre precheus
Et chaitis et maleureus.

In spite of the negative, moralising tone of some parts of the passage cited (9 - 16, 25 - 34), it also contains advice to the young knight: to seek his fortune abroad.
This advice is heeded by Philippe's hero. Like Engelhard, he reviews his situation at home and then decides to go abroad:

71 Sa mere que envillir voit
Et son pere qui mout devoit,
Ses sereurs, ses freres aussi,
Voit que tuit sont avoeques li.
Un jour pensa que son tans port;
Asses ert ki son pere sert
Sans lui, si li vint en talent,
Com cil qui n'eut pas le cuer lent,
Qu'il s'en iroit en Engletere.

Both Jehan and Engelhard are motivated by the poverty of their parents and by the hope of acquiring riches abroad: Jehan et Blonde, 81, 'Ne veut pas despendre la tere/ Que ses peres tient follement,/ Ains conquerra, s'il puet, plus grant. Engelhard, 314, 'ich getriuwe sinen [Fruote's] êren/ daz er mich vazze schöne/
und er mir noch ze lône/ vil richiu swertlêhen gebe./ daz ist vil bezzer denne ich lebe/ alsô
verdorbenliche.

There are three reasons for my assumption that Konrad knew *Jehan et Blonde* and used it as a source for the motivation of Engelhard's departure.

Firstly, the structure of the two narratives is identical up to the point where the hero goes to ask leave of his father to go abroad. Both poems begin with the description of the hero's father: *Jehan et Blonde*, 49, 'Il ot un chevalier en France,/ Qui ot esté de grant vaillance/Tant comme il les armes maintint;' — *Engelhard*, 221, 'dô lebte in Burgundrîche/ vil getriuwelîche/ ein herre von gebürte frî.' They continue with a short description of the hero's mother: *Jehan et Blonde*, 56, 'Mout bonne dame a fame avoit' — *Engelhard*, 226, 'ein schoenez wip er háste/ an herzen und an lîbe.' Then, the number of children is mentioned (six in *Jehan et Blonde*, ten in *Engelhard*). The hero is described next and then follows the hero's consideration of his position, with the resolve to
leave home. In both cases, the hero's decision is immediately followed by action: Jehan et Blonde, 84, 'Ainsi comme il pansa le fist.' - Engelhard, 320, 'susz gienc der tugentliche/ zehant für sinen werden vater'.

Secondly, all three factors which motivate Engelhard's departure are also found in Jehan et Blonde. It has been shown that single factors can be traced in German works which Konrad may have known (and they may well have influenced him in points of detail), but Jehan et Blonde is the only poem known to me which combines all these factors.

Thirdly, the dependence of Konrad on Jehan et Blonde for motif material is not limited to this instance. There are two further points of contact which will be discussed under the appropriate headings.

19 Cf. pp. 107 - 110, above.

2. The Story of the Three Apples.

I have been unable to trace this motif to any source earlier than Engelhard. The test of friendship by means of an apple seems to have had some popularity

Schmiede which, according to Reiffenstein, was probably written in the same period as Engelhard. hat Schröder (Studien a. a. O. IV, Gött. Nachrichten 1917, 115 f.) mit der Erbauung des Strassburger Münsters in Beziehung gesetzt und ihre Entstehung ca. 1277 vermutet. Für Beziehungen zu Strassburg auch bei der Entstehung des Engelhard liess sich das Weiterleben des Amicus-Amelius-Stoffes dort anführen (Jakobsbrüder!). The most recent study on the chronology of Konrad's works (Helmut de Boor, 'Die Chronologie der Werke Konrads von Würzburg, insbesondere die Stellung des Turniers von Nantes', FRB, LXXXIX (1968), 210 - 269) does not contribute anything to the dating of Engelhard. It cannot reasonably be suggested that the influence could have been the other way round (i.e. Engelhard on Jehan et Blonde). Konrad frequently makes use of French sources (cf. pp. 102 f., above), whereas in Philippe's work there is no evidence that he made use of German sources.
in folk literature. It can also be found in some versions of the legend Die Jakobsbrüder.

3. King Fruote's Court in Denmark

Engelhard decides to go to the court of king Fruote of Denmark, and it is at Fruote's court that the judicial combat takes place. With few exceptions it is generally the court of Charlemagne where the two young friends serve and one falls in love.

In courtly German literature of the 13th century, Fruote appears to have been regarded as the model of generosity, wisdom and courtly manners. Moriz Haupt even refers to a

---


22 Cf. p. 94, note 39, above.

23 In the Middle English Amis and Amiloun, the two boys are educated at the court of an unnamed duke of Lombardy, and in the Historia, the setting is the court of the emperor Titus.

24 Cf. the stanza by Herger, cited p. 109, above, where Fruote's wealth stands in contrast to the poet's poverty.
proverbial use of Fruote's name in this sense by Seifried Helbling. In view of the widespread traditional associations of the name, no single text can be named as Konrad's source.

4. The Love of Engeltrût for Both Friends.

There may be no immediate source for this incident, which Konrad may well have invented. It is a piece of 'minne' casuistry: Engeltrût, who wishes to love one man, cannot decide whether to love Engelhard or Dieterich, because of their identical appearance.

What Konrad describes is a variation of the situation where two men strive for the love of the same lady, and she is forced to choose one - a situation well known in Classical MHG lyric writing and also in theoretical


\[\text{26} \] In my discussion of the primary sources, pp. 169 - 171, below, I attempt to show some of the reasons for Konrad's choice of Fruote's court.
treatises on courtly love. The variation is the fact that it is Engeltrüt who falls in love with both friends, and they are unaware of her feelings.

5. The Death of Engeltrüt's Mother

From the point of view of narrative technique, this incident allows Engeltrüt openly to show her sorrow because of her unrequited love for Engelhard. Fruote, who perceives her suffering and thinks that it is because of her mother's death, then appoints Engelhard as her chamberlain. The love-story has been static up to this point, and it is the mother's death and the consequent reaction of Fruote to his daughter's grief, which set it in motion.

From the point of view of the 'minne' theme, however, the death of Engeltrüt's mother provides a conflict within Engeltrüt between the mourning for her beloved and the mourning for her mother. This is another

point where, in my view, the influence of Jehan et Blonde becomes evident. At one point in the narrative, Jehan is informed by a messenger that his mother has died and that his father is too frail to manage his lands. Jehan therefore has to return home and take over the fief. Philippe de Remi comments:

1703 Grant duel a de la mort sa mere
   Et de l'enfermeté son pere;
   Mais ne li est fors que rousee
   Vers le duel de la dessevree
   Qu'il fera de sa douce amie.

   In both poems, the mourning for the beloved proves stronger than the mourning for the mother.

   It is admittedly true that the two situations differ in some respects. In Jehan et Blonde it is the pain of parting which is stronger, while in Engelhard it is the pain of unrequited love. But the plot of Engelhard gave Konrad no opportunity to introduce the conflict in a situation similar to that in Jehan et Blonde. It is Dieterich, not Engelhard, who is called home by a messenger to take over his inheritance. So Konrad adapts the motif and uses it to motivate Engelhard's appointment
as Engeltrût's chamberlain.

6. The Table Scene.

Engelhard, as Engeltrût's chamberlain, is in constant contact with her. She hints to him that she loves him (1882 ff.) and he falls in love with her. However, he does not dare to confess his love to her. He finally betrays his feelings by dropping the knife with which he cuts food for Engeltrût at the table:

1966 nû kam ez zeiner zît alsô
daz er solte snîden
der klâren und der blîden
über tische, sô man saget.
er kniete für die schoenen maget
und diente ir nâch gewonheit.
nû daz er iezuo alsô sneit,
dô dâhte er an ir minne
sô verre in sînem simne
daz er sîn selbes dô vergaz
unde er niht enweste waz
er solte schaffen unde tuon.
er liez alsam ein toubez huon
daz mezzer vallen von der hant.
daz im von minne niht geswant,
daz was ein grôzez wunder.
iedoch wart im hier under
sin varwe sô verwandelt
und alsô missehandelt
daz sin diu schoene wart gewar,
daz im von rehter minne gar
diz dinc geschehen wære.

This incident corresponds in
many points to a similar scene in Jehan et Blonde.
Jehan, like Engelhard, has to cut at the table of
his beloved. One day, he is so struck by her
beauty that he forgets to carry out his duties. He
is called back to his senses by his lady. The next
day, he has to cut his lady's food again:

458 Adonc ra Jehans paine mise
    A li servir si comme il seut.
    Mais li desirs dont il se deu.
Li fait jeter les ex a cele,
Dont il esprent de l'estincele.
Si ententiument le regarde
Que de riens ne se donne garde
Fors sans plus de li esgarder.
La seut il son sens mal garder,
Car par cel fol regardement
Dut morir sans recouvrement.
Du regart en tel penser vint
Que de trencier ne li souvint.
Blonde, qui si le voit penser,
De cel penser le veut tenser,
Si li dist que il trence tost,
Mais il ne l'entent pas si tost.
Puis li redist: 'Jehan, trenchiés!
Dormés vous chi, ou vous songiés?
S'il vous plaist, donés m'a mengier,
Ne ne voellié or plus songier.'
A cel mot Jehans l'entendi,
S'est tressalis tout autressi
Com cil qui en soursaut s'esveille.
De s'aventure s'esmervelle.
Tous abaubis tint son coutel,
Et quid a trenchier bien et bel;
Mais de penser est si destrois
Que il s'est trenckés en deus dois;
Li sans en saut et il se lieve.

In both cases, the man is so distracted by love that he forgets himself: 'Que de riens ne se donnne garde'-'daz er sin selbes dö vergaz'. In Jehan et Blonde he cuts himself and then faints, while in Engelhard he drops the knife and almost faints.

The relative position of the lovers and the basic situation is identical in both poems. In both cases, the men are chamberlains to the daughter of their lord, and in both cases, their love distracts them from their duty when they are cutting food for their beloved.

The motif is that of a person who is so distracted by love that he cuts himself instead of cutting the food before him. Reinhold Köhler has investigated the prevalence of this motif both in oriental and European literature. He supplies a list of examples and references which indicate that in Europe the motif is found above all in the folk
literature of the 15th and 16th centuries. In view of
the similarities already shown between Jehan et Blonde
and Engelhard, it appears almost certain that Konrad
took the table scene from this poem.

Konrad has compressed the narrative considerably.
Whereas in Jehan et Blonde the love story is a central
feature, and therefore includes two table scenes and—
later—several meetings between Blonde and the love-sick
Jehan, Konrad confines himself to one table scene and one
meeting.

7. The Tournament in Normandy.

This is in all probability an invention by Konrad.
Moriz Haupt, the first editor of Engelhard, comments as
follows: '... ich glaube diese episode mindestens hat
Konrad erfunden um sich in der beschreibung eines
turnieres zu ergehen.'

28 It is possible that Jehan et Blonde and Engelhard may
be partly responsible for the prevalence of this motif
in 15th and 16th century European folk literature.

29 Cf. pp. 111 ff. and 120 ff., above.

This may indeed be one reason for the inclusion of the tournament. A further possible reason is that Konrad wished to depict Engelhard's prowess, since the plot of the friendship tale required Engelhard to seek help from Dieterich in the only actual combat found in the poem.

If the tournament is an invention, it is skilfully motivated. Engelhard must prove his valour before Engeltrût will grant him her love. This is a natural request from a lady whose honour may depend on the strength and skill of her champion.

8. The Meeting of Engelhard and Engeltrût in the Orchard and their Discovery.

Similarities between this scene and the discovery of the lovers in Chrétien de Troyes's Cligés have been pointed out by Hans Herzog. In both poems the lovers meet secretly in an orchard under a tree in bloom. The traitor who discovers them is led to their secret meeting place by his escaped sparrow-hawk. Trying to retrieve the bird, the traitor enters the orchard and surprises the

31 'Zum Clîes und Engelhard', Germania, XXXI (1886), 325 - 326.
lovers. He then goes to make his accusation to the king.

This similarity of motif material is not the only point of contact between Cligés and Engelhard: there are also some points of stylistic similarity between the two poems.


In all extant versions of the friendship tale, except Engelhard, the leprous friend is expelled from his home. After a period of wandering, he reaches the court of his companion where he is recognised only after he has presented the recognition-token (a cup or a ring). It is possible that, from where Dieterich falls ill until his arrival at Engelhard's court, Konrad may have used a source other than the friendship tale.

32 In Cligés, he climbs over a wall, while in Engelhard, he finds a secret door. This door is also described in Cligés, but the traitor does not use it.

33 Cf. pp. 138 - 146, below.
Maria Luise Gräff and Erich Kaiser have noted that the island to which the leprous Dieterich retreats is described in terms of the literary ideal landscape, the 'locus amoenus'. According to Kaiser, Konrad chose this setting to provide a contrast between the setting and the wretchedness of Dieterich's condition. The views of Wolfgang Monecke on Konrad's descriptive technique corroborate Kaiser's findings.

Gräff and Kaiser have partly answered the question


why Konrad chose the 'locus amoenus' as a setting for the description of the leprous Dieterich. The key to a fuller answer lies in the description itself.

There are strong similarities between Konrad's description of the leprous Dieterich and the description of Gregorius, on his island, by Hartmann von Aue.38

**Engelhard 5150**

im wurden hâr unde bart
dünn unde seltsane.
sîn ougen, als ich waene,
begunden sich dô gilwen.
as ob si æzen milwen,
sô vielen ûz die brâwen
drobe.
sîn varwe, diu då vor ze
lobe
liutsæelechlich was unde guot, und veiz mit guotem vlîze
diu wart noch röter danne
ein bluot
und gap vil egebaeren schîn. ê wären im vür war

**Gregorius 3423**

Der arme was zewâre
erwahsen von dem håre,
verwalken zuo der swarte,
an houbet und an barte:
ê was ez ze rehte reit,
mû ruozvar von der arbeit.
ê wären im diu wangen
mit röte bevangen
mit gemischeter wîze
nu swarz und in gewichen,
daz antlutze erblichen

diu lûtersüeze stimme sîn wart unmâzen heiser.
im schoof des himels keiser grôz leit an allen enden.
an füezen unde an henden wären im die ballen
sô genzlich in gevallen daz mich sîn immer wundert.
sîn lip der wart gesundert vil gar von schoenen sachen und wart mit ungemachen jaemelichen überladen.
diu ougen gelph unde klâr, der munt ze vreuden gestalt, nû bleich unde kalt, diu ougen tief trüebe rôt als ez der mangel gebôt, mit brâwen behangen rûhen unde lengen,
ê grôz zen liden allen daz vleisch, nû zuo gevallen unz an daz gebeine:
er was sô glîche kleine an beinen und an armen, ez möhte got erbarmen.

Erich Kaiser compares Konrad's description of Dieterich's leprosy with Hartmann's description of the change in Heinrich's life brought about by leprosy in Der arme Heinrich. 39

Kaiser comes to the following conclusion: "Anders als im "Armen Heinrich" erscheint dadurch der Aussatz wirklich als Krankheit, die den schönen Körper zerstört. Während Hartmanns Antithesen die Wende in Heinrichs Leben als beispielhaft für menschliche Existenz überhaupt darstellen, rückt Konrad hier den Gegensatz zwischen junger Schönheit des Leibes und ihrem Verfall in den Vordergrund. It is in the passage in Gregorius cited above (which admittedly does not describe the symptoms of leprosy) that Hartmann expresses the contrast between beauty and decay.

Like Hartmann, Konrad describes the leper in strict sequence, beginning with 'hår und bart' (5150), then describing the face (with individual features in different sequence to Hartmann), and finally describing the limbs and the body generally. Like Hartmann, Konrad uses the former beauty and health of his hero as a 'terminus comparationis' in a series of antitheses describing his present wretched state.

There are, however, some points in the description where Konrad is in direct contrast to Hartmann. The hair

and beard of Gregorius are profuse and matted (3423-3426). Dieterich's hair and beard, on the other hand, are 'dünn unde seltsæne' (5151). Gregorius's eyebrows are coarse and long ((3442), while Dieterich's are falling out (5155). These two points of difference may be due to Konrad's wish to give a medically accurate picture of the symptoms of leprosy.\(^{41}\) There are however further points of contrast for which this explanation is inadequate.

Hartmann uses the colour red twice: once to denote health, when he refers to the colour of Gregorius's complexion (3430) and once to denote the effects of privation when he describes his eyes (3439). Konrad refers to Dieterich's colouring in an antithesis in which he contrasts 'liutsælic unde guot' (5157) with 'røeter danne ein bluot' (5158).

Finally, Hartmann makes a contrast between the face of Gregorius as it once was: 'veiz mit guotem vlîze' (3432) and as it is now: 'erblichen' (3434). Hartmann thus refers to a radiance which is now lost. Konrad, on the other hand, instead of contrasting radiance with dullness, intensifies the radiance: 'noch røeter danne ein bluot'\(^{41}\)

---

(5158), and turns the radiance itself into a dreadful thing: 'und gap vil egebæreren schin' (5159).

This mixture of similarity and contrast is not limited to the description of the two suffering men: it also extends to the setting in which they are described. In both poems, the person is on an island and cut off from his court by his own decision:

**Gregorius**

2745 'dem lande und dem guote
   und werlțîchem muote
   dem sî hiute widerseit.'
   hin tet er diu rîchen kleit
   und schiet sich von dem lande
   mit dürftigen gewande.

**Engelhard**

5260 friunde, mâge, dienestman
   hiez er belîben hinder im,
   als ich diu mære alhie vernim,
   und îlte schiere sâ zehant
   mit jâmer in daz einlant
   då sîn wonunge solte sîn.

The contrast lies in the description of the two islands. Hartmann characterises the rock on which Gregorius
lives with the adjective 'wilde'. Konrad, on the other hand, describes Dieterich's island as 'michel unde schoene' (5229), indeed: 'alsam ein irdesch paradis/ beschöenest stuont diz einlant.' (5234/35). Instead of Hartmann's bleak wilderness, Konrad paints a picture of abundant growth.

Details are also contrasted. When Hartmann states:

3105 er enhete anderen gemach,
niuan der himel was sin dach.
er enhete deheinen scherm mê
vür rîfen noch vür snê,
vür wint noch vür regen
niuwan den gotes segen.

Konrad writes: 'Im wart bereit vil guot gemach' (5247). Hartmann's reference to the sky as the only roof and protection for Gregorius is echoed and contrasted by Konrad four times:

5318 vor der sunnen blicke
truoc er einen pfâwenhuot
und ein gewant von sîden guot
daz als ein lichter spiegel was.

42 Cf. Gregorius, 2985, 3103, 3138, 3355.
hie mite kam er durch daz gras
geslichen zuo dem brunnen kalt.
dâ stuont von böumen obe ein walt
vil maneger hande leie.
der liehte süeze meie
was komen dô mit sîner maht
dâ von der brunne was bedaht
mit wûnneclichen esten.
ûz grüenem loube glesten
sach man die snêwize bluot.
diu was des brunnen schatehuot
und hæten sich gehûset drîn
diu wilden waltvogellîn
vor der hitze durch gemach.
vil schoene was ir überdach
von bletern und von rise.

Not only Dieterich is protected, but also the
fountain and the birds. Hartmann refers to 'rifen', 'snê',
'wint', 'regen' (3108/09). Konrad, on the other hand,
refers to 'sunne' (5318), 'meie'; (5326), 'hitze' (5335),
'sumerliche zît' (5349).

While Hartmann makes the point that Gregorius was
wearing nothing but a hair shirt and had no food (3111,
Konrad stresses that Dieterich suffered no lack:

Im wart bereit vil guot gemach.
daz wazzer und der schoene bach
fluzzzen um den selben wert
im was da wunnen vil beschert
von liehter ougen weide.
kneht unde megede beide
ze dienste man im zuo beschiet.
vil harte wol man in beriet
spis unde liehter kleider.

The sparse flow of water on the rock on which Gregorius sits (3123) is turned into a delight by Konrad:
'der brunne liliter unde kalt/ gienc ruschende unde klingende.' (5344/45).

In my view, Konrad's description of the leprous Dieterich and the island to which he withdraws is an attempt on Konrad's part to draw attention to Hartmann's description of Gregorius - which he could fairly assume to be well known to his audience. By contrasting Dieterich's condition and position with that of Gregorius, Konrad makes a comment on Dieterich's innocence before God. Konrad's source required that Dieterich be stricken with leprosy. Hartmann calls this disease 'gotes zuht' in
Der arme Heinrich, of which numerous echoes are also found in Engelhard. Konrad himself describes leprosy as a punishment of God in his Silvester. He appears to be concerned to show that Dieterich is not to be regarded as a sinner who is punished for his trespasses. His contrast with a passage from Gregorius is one way of showing this.


44 Cf. pp. 146 - 147, below.


46 Konrad also stresses the innocence of Dieterich by direct statements:

5430 wan in [got] begunde erdriezen
der bitterlichen swære
die der vil triuwebaere
leit ân alle sine schult.
The nine motifs in *Engelhard*—discussed above—are not found in other versions of the *Amicus* and *Amelius* tradition. Hans Herzog has shown that there are important similarities between a scene in Chrétien de Troyes's *Cligés* and a scene in *Engelhard*.\(^\text{47}\) I hope to have shown that there are significant relationships between Philippe de Remi's *Jehan et Blonde* and Hartmann's *Gregorius* on the one hand, and *Engelhard* on the other. The discussion of the nine motifs has also indicated the possibility that Konrad may well have known at least some of the work of Herger, Thomasin von Zerklaere, der Marner, and Meister Boppe.

In addition to the nine motifs which Konrad added to the friendship tale, he also used secondary sources when treating incidents from his primary source. In these latter cases, he is indebted to secondary sources above all for style and imagery.

One of these works—*Cligés*—has already been mentioned in the examination of the nine motifs. In my view, Chrétien influenced Konrad not only with respect to the motif discussed above, but also in his imagery. In the love story in *Cligés*, both

---

lovers at first love each other without confessing this love. Chrétien comments:

601 Adés croist lor amors et monte;
Mes li uns a de l'autre honte,
Si se cele et cuevre chacuns,
Quë il n'i pert flame ne funs
Del charbon, qui est soz la çandre.
Por ce n'est pas la chalors mandre,
Einçois dure la chalors plus
Dessoz la çandre que dessus. 48

In Engelhard, Engeltrût loves Engelhard who does not know of her love. Konrad uses the following image:

1732 si kunde jâmer dulden
verholne zuo dem mâle.
dâ von sô wart ir quâle
deste groezer alle zît.
ein fiur, swâ daz verborgen lît
tougenlichen etewâ,

daz brinnet schedelicher dâ
dan ob ez offen würde.
als tuot der minne bürde
die man verborgenlichen treit.
swâ trûren unde sendez leit
verholne sint enbrunnen,
dâ wirt diu nôt gewunnen
diu vcrre wirs dem herzen tuot
und vaster dringet in den muot
dan offenlichez ungemach.

In both cases, secret love is likened to a covered
fire which burns with more intensity than an open one.
With Chrétien, the image itself is more fully developed
than with Konrad: it is more detailed and includes more
visual observation. Konrad presents the image itself
more simply, in four verses, while its application to
the love situation is explained in eight verses. Each
key word of the image is either repeated or replaced by
a synonym in the explanation.49

---

49 verborgen (1734) - verborgenlichen (1741); tougenlichen
(1737) - verholne (1743); schedelicher (1738) -
wirs (1745); brinnet (1738) - enbrunnen (1743);
offen (1739) - offenlichez ungemach (1747).
This particular image does not appear to have been used in Classical or Late Classical MHG writings before Konrad. It can therefore be assumed that Konrad took over and adapted the image from Chrétien's Cligés.

A second image which Konrad may well have taken over from Cligés is found in the description of a combat. Chrétien writes:

4070 As espees notent un lai
    Sor les hiaumes qui retantissent,
    Si que lor janz s'an esbaissent,
    Et sanble a çaus qui les esgardent,
    Que li hiaume espraignent et ardent.
    Et quant les espees ressail lent,
    Estanceles ardan zan saillent
    Aussi come de fer qui fume,
    Que li fevres bat sor l'anclume,
    Quant il le tret de la favarge.

Konrad uses the same image twice in Engelhard. It is found in the description of the tournament in Normandy:

2728 ouch hörte man dar unter
      von slegen ein getemere
      als ob da tüs ent hemere
      klungen in dem louge.

The image is also found in Konrad's account of the judicial combat:

4851 ir slege wären alsô grôz
      daz ūf einen anebôz
geschach nie grözer tængeln.

It will be noted that Chrétien, after describing the sound of the swords (4070 - 72), uses the image of the smith to illustrate a visual feature of the combat. In Engelhard 2728 ff., Konrad uses the same image to describe the sound of the battle. Once again, he contracts Chrétien's description.

The image of the smith's anvil appears to be rare in Classical and Late Classical MHG descriptions of combat.\textsuperscript{51} Wolfram von Eschenbach uses it in \textit{Parzival} and Willehalm.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{51} In addition to personal inquiries, I have used the reference works listed in note 50, p. 141, above. A further work which I have consulted in respect of this image is Friedrich Bode, \textit{Die Kampfesschilderungen in den mittelhochdeutschen Epen}. Diss., Greifswald, 1909.

The image of the smith and the anvil is further found in a description of a combat in the Rolandslied of Pfaffe Konrad: 53

4118 sam der smît tingel[œ]t uf den ambôz,
so daz isen ist inglûte,
..... uf schilte unt uf hûte.

From the Rolandslied, it found its way into the Stricker's Karl der Grosse: 54

5124 sam die smide slânt ûf den ambôz,
so daz îsen ist vaste in gluote,
sluoc mans ûf die schilde und ûf die huote.

Two factors support the view that Konrad von Würzburg depended on Cligés for this image, and not on the German examples cited above. Firstly, Konrad's dependence on Cligés has already been demonstrated, 55


while no stylistic echoes of either Wolfram or the two treatments of the Roland material can be shown in Engelhard. Secondly, Konrad used this image in other poems, but only in those written after Engelhard. It is found twice in the Turnier von Nantes (794 and 812), and once in the Trojanerkrieg (12 802). One example

Erich Kaiser, op cit., pp. 61 f., suggests that Konrad may have been influenced in his description of the leprous Dieterich by Wolfram's description of the sick Amfortas. Kaiser cites three points of similarity: 1. Both sick people seek fresh air. 2. Both wear a hat made of peacock feathers. 3. In both poems, the splendour of the surroundings is contrasted with the wretched condition of the sufferer. In the absence of further evidence, these parallels (and they are confined to this one description) appear to be too general to suggest a direct relationship.


in the Turnier von Nantes closely resembles Chrétien's image in Cligés 4075 - 4079:

794 dô sprungen fiures flammen
ûz helmen alsô grôze
als ûf dem anebôze
die gneisten von dem îsen.

Textual parallels between Hartmann's Der arme Heinrich and the story of the leprous Dieterich in Engelhard have been noted by Moriz Haupt and Karl Helm, and they have been interpreted by Erich Kaiser and Wolfgang Monecke. According to both Kaiser and Monecke, Konrad 'quoted' Hartmann in order to draw attention to his new and different treatment of the leprosy motif. They note that Konrad generally expands his source by adding detail. In other words, he 'fills in' details which are only suggested by his source. Konrad's 'quotation' of other works

60 'Zum Engelhard', PBB, XXXXVII (1923), 155 - 156.
has already been seen in the case of Gregorius. He appears to 'quote' in order to draw attention to his own work and the differences in his treatment of similar motifs.

Konrad himself acknowledges his indebtedness to Gottfried von Strassburg, and the influence of Tristan on Engelhard has been confirmed by several comparative studies. Some of Gräff's points may need revision in the light of my own findings. Gräff

---

64 Cf. pp. 99 - 100, above.
claims that Konrad's description of Dieterich's leprosy (Engelhard 5150 - 5171) is influenced by Gottfried's description of Rual (Tristan 4000 - 4013). 67 I hope to have shown that it was Hartmann's Gregorius, rather than Gottfried's Tristan, which influenced Konrad at this particular point.

A further point made by Gräff is that Konrad, like Gottfried, is not interested in the description of battles and tournaments. 68 As evidence for this view, Gräff observes that Konrad does not exploit the scene where Engelhard and Ritschier are dubbed knights. In my view, this generalisation from one incident in Engelhard is not justified. There are two major combat scenes in Engelhard, and both are given full and detailed descriptions. Konrad may well have been prompted to shorten the dubbing scene by considerations of form. The two combats in Engelhard are both connected with Engeltrüt.

67 A comparison of Tristan 4000 - 4013 and Gregorius 3379 - 3381, 3423 - 3448 would suggest that Gottfried may well have been influenced by Hartmann at this point.

68 Maria Luise Gräff, op. cit., p. 51.
In the first battle (the tournament in Normandy, 2463 - 2879), Engelhard wins the hand of Engeltrût (his participation at the tournament is one of the conditions he must fulfill before she will grant him her love). In the second battle (the judicial combat, 4653 - 4960), Dieterich wins the hand of Engeltrût on behalf of Engelhard. It may not have been lack of interest, but rather Konrad's desire to give each of the two heroes a combat scene, which motivated the shortening of the dubbing scene. 69

In certain parts of Engelhard there is pronounced evidence of the influence of the Willehalm von Orlens of Rudolf von Ems. 70 In those parts where the two poems

---

69 Further evidence for the assumption that Konrad was in fact interested in tournaments and descriptions of combat is supplied by his Turnier von Nantes, which comprises exclusively the description of a tournament.

share thematic material, Konrad makes use of a succession of images which, on account of their textual closeness, can be derived only from Rudolf's Willehalm. 71

Konrad appears to have been influenced by

---

71 Helmut de Boor refers to the possibility of Rudolf's influence on Engelhard in general terms. Helmut de Boor, Richard Nowald, *op. cit.*, III/1, 33: 'Der exemplarische Ablauf einer vorbildlichen Minne soll zur Anschauung kommen. Hier hat wohl der Wilhelm von Orlens des grossen Vermittlers Rudolf von Ems Pate gestanden. Gleich jenem stellt er seine Erzählung in einen geographisch realen Raum. Wie Wilhelm ziehen die jungen Knappen zu ihrer Ausbildung an einen fremden Hof, wo sie alle Herzen gewinnen. Wie Wilhelm wird Engelhard von der Gewalt der Minne bis zum Hinsiechen ergriffen, dem das Liebesgeständnis der Königstochter ein Ende macht, wie bei Wilhelm wird das Geheimnis der Minne offenbar und führt zu Ungemach und Bedrohung.' All these parallels, however, may also be traced between the *Historia* account of the *Amicus* and *Amelius* tale, and *Engelhard*. 
Willehalm in the composition of the love story. Both Rudolf and Konrad use the same image when introducing their heroines:

Engelhard 878
ir herze in êren bluote
als ein geziert meien ris.

Willehalm 3721
Der welte lop, der sälden
pris,
an ir lac der erwelte pris
und daz lebende wunnen spil
daz man von wiben haben wil.

There are also some similarities between Rudolf and Konrad in the sick-bed scene:

2279
'Engelhard, wie tuost du nû? Si aprach 'geselle, wie maht
mahtû genesen oder niht? Maht du genesen, das sag

4851
du?
mir nu!

2289
4905
sô bin ich immer ungenesen, Si sprach 'trut, maht du
ir enweilet danne wesen genesen?

genäedic unde günstic mir72 'Ja, wend ir mir gnäedic wesen.'

72 Cf. also Hartmann von Aue, Der arme Heinrich, 203 f.
The fathers' reactions to the information that their daughters and the heroes are lovers, are also similar:

**Engelhard** 3582

sit daz er nú die triuwe sin Owe der grossen missetat
an mir só gar zerbrochen hätt, Das er sine truwe hat
sô muoz er sîner missetät So ser an mir zerbrochen:
ingelten, wan er sol sin leben
und den lip dar umbe geben.

Finally, when the girl visits her love-sick lover at his bedside, she promises him her love in both poems on the condition that he is willing to be dubbed a knight:

**Engelhard** 2352

diu mære wîte erschollen sint
daz ir beide wellent swert.
sô muostû, trûtgeselle wert,
ritter werden ouch mit im.

**Willehalm** 5152

So wil ich das dü laitest swert
Und disse liehten sumerzit
Des komen uns vil nahe lit,
Mit dienste min ritter sist,

This comparison supports de Boor's view that Rudolf's **Willehalm** influenced Konrad in the composition of **Engelhard**.
Rudolf's influence can be traced in Konrad's style at those points where Engelhard and Willehalm share motif material. In view of the thematic parallels between Engelhard and the Historia tradition of the friendship tale, it appears unlikely however that Konrad was influenced, as de Boor suggests, by the plot of the love story in Willehalm.

The final poet to be considered in this discussion of possible influences on Konrad's Engelhard is Walther von Prisach.\textsuperscript{72} One of his stanzas, on 'triuwe', reads as follows: \textsuperscript{73}

\begin{quote}
Diu triuwe ist lieht ein spiegel, rehter wunne ein ougenweide,
der éren barn, der tugende muoter gar ân unterscheide, doch si verâhtet ist gevarn, ein frömde gast, verjaget ûz den landen.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{72} According to Helga Reuschel, Verfasserlexikon, IV, 789, Walther von Prisach may have lived in Freiburg i.B. from 1271 - 1294. He would then have been a contemporary and close neighbour of Konrad's. Cf. also Carl von Kraus, ed., Deutsche Liederdichter des 13. Jahrhunderts. Tübingen, 1952, II, 624.

diu triuwe lêret guotes friundes êren iemer huoten,
vermîden valschez guot, mit hertem sturme niemer
wuoten.

diu triuwe kan vor schanden warn,
triuw unde mâze meinenent sich ze handen.
si machet îzer zwein ein ein,
die man vil dicke vindet ungemein:
daz ist daz herze und niht dem herzen jehender munt.
diu triuwe kan niht wankelspli;
dar umbe, die ir volgent, derst niht vil.
diu triuwe lieber wîlent was dann goldes funt,
dô si die herren unde ir hof bekanden.

Most of the ideas found in this stanza are also found in the prologue to Engelhard. The idea that 'triuwe' is a bright, gleaming virtue (Walther 1) is expressed by Konrad in his reference to her former state: 'ir liehten kleider leider blint/ durch valschen orden worden sint' (3/4), 'ir lop kan üeben trüeben glast' (11). Cf. also 30. The plight of 'triuwe' (Walther 3/4) is described by Konrad 3 - 24, 127 - 139. Walther's reference to the fact that 'triuwe' teaches men honesty (6) is expanded by Konrad, 41 - 48. 'Triuwe' as a peacemaker, implied in the second half of Walther 6, is found in Konrad's stanza
8 (57 - 64). Walther's negative statement, 'diu triuwe kan niht wankelspil' (12) is expressed positively by Konrad (33 - 38, 75 - 76).

There are three conclusions which may be drawn from this examination of Konrad's secondary sources for Engelhard. Firstly, the influence of several writers on Konrad may be traced in Engelhard. While Konrad himself regarded Gottfried as his master, and while Gottfried's influence on Engelhard is considerable, it is still an oversimplification to classify Konrad, without qualification, as a disciple of Gottfried. Even those passages of Engelhard which were strongly influenced by Gottfried's Tristan (e. g. the love story), show the influence of other writers as well.

Secondly, Konrad had recourse to secondary sources above all in the composition of the love story. My analysis of structure in chapter I, shows that the love story in Engelhard, by comparison with other versions of the friendship tale, is expanded considerably. While the love story does contain some material which was probably invented by Konrad, the influence of several writers may be traced.

Thirdly, Konrad treated his secondary sources with
considerable freedom. He adapted and re-created motifs of other writers to fit them to his purpose. This process of adaptation appears to take two directions. The first, which has already been noted by Kaiser and Monecke, is Konrad's move towards a greater degree of realism, above all in the description of the symptoms of leprosy. On the other hand, Konrad also adapts secondary sources in the opposite direction, by moderating the tone of the passage. In Jehan et Blonde, for example, Jehan's mother is getting old while his father is in debt. Konrad states merely that Engelhard's parents did not have enough money. Similarly, in the table scene, Engelhard does not cut himself and faint (as does Jehan), he only drops the knife and almost faints.

Konrad's tendency to amplify motifs from other writers by the addition of detail can also be seen in his adaptation of formulas and images by other poets. In some instances, Konrad 'interprets' images, which he adapts by carefully spelling out their application to the

74 Cf. pp. 128, 146 f., above.
75 Cf. pp. 113 ff., above.
76 Cf. pp. 121 ff., above.
situation which he is describing.\footnote{Cf. his treatment of the Chrétien fire image, discussed pp. 139 ff., above.}

In view of the number and diversity of secondary sources which Konrad used in the composition of \textit{Engelhard}, (and in view of the freedom with which he treated them), it may be assumed that Konrad not only amplified his primary source(s) and added new incidents, but also that he treated the primary source(s) freely in other ways. Konrad also must have adapted primary source material by moderating the harshness of some incidents.
CHAPTER IV

THE PRIMARY SOURCES

The analysis of Engelhard from the point of view of structure (chapter I), and secondary sources (chapter III) allows some conclusions to be drawn about Konrad's method of composition.

It was Konrad's intention to write a poem in praise of 'triuwe'. He realised this intention by using a primary source or sources as a basis for his narrative, and by adding to it incidents from various other works. The poem is narrated in four sections, each of which has its own internal structural arrangement. In other words, Konrad shaped his material, by dividing it into four

1 Cf. p. 58, above.
sections, and he expanded it, by adding further material.

The diversity of the Amicus and Amelius tradition, outlined in chapter II, and Konrad's free treatment of his source material are two factors which complicate the search for his primary source. By surveying and classifying the tradition, and eliminating those motifs in Engelhard which come from secondary sources, I hope to have established a basis on which a comparison of Konrad's poem with the tradition of the friendship tale may be attempted.

In the light of the findings in chapter III, it is now possible to delete a number of motifs from the initial plot summary of Engelhard,² because Konrad will have either taken them from secondary sources, or else invented them. This will provide us with a 'basic plot', as close as possible to the tradition of the friendship tale, which will be used in the comparison. The summary now reads as follows:

Engelhard decides to go to the court of king Fruote. On the way, he meets Dieterich who looks exactly like him, and they swear a friendship troth. Both boys are

² Cf. pp. 7 - 11, above.
well received at Fruote's court. Their personal qualities
and their love for each other endear them to the people
at the court.

Fruote has a daughter, called Engeltrūt. She falls
in love with Engelhard and pines for him, but he is
unaware of her affection.

Dieterich is called back to his home by a messenger
who brings the news that his father, the prince of
Brabant, has died and that Dieterich must now take up
his inheritance. After a conversation, the friends part
from each other.

Engelhard is appointed chamberlain to Engeltrūt and
he falls in love with her. When the two lovers meet
secretly, they are discovered and betrayed. As Engelhard
denies the charge of illicit love-making, he is ordered to
prove his innocence in a judicial combat.

On the pretext of going on a pilgrimage, Engelhard
takes leave from the king's court and travels to
Dieterich to seek advice. The two friends meet at night.
At Dieterich's suggestion they exchange clothes.
Engelhard remains in Brabant as Dieterich, while the
latter travels to Fruote's court in the guise of Engelhard.

Every night, when he goes to bed, Engelhard places
a sword between himself and Dieterich's wife, who does not discover his true identity and takes him for her husband.

Dieterich (as Engelhard) fights the judicial combat and defeats Ritschier by striking off his left hand. The king, now convinced of Engelhard's innocence, gives him his daughter in marriage. Dieterich places a sword between himself and Engeltrut. Pretending to set out on a pilgrimage, he leaves Fruote's court and returns to Brabant. Secretly, the friends exchange clothes again and each returns to his original place.

After some time, Dieterich is struck with leprosy. He leaves his court. In a dream, an angel tells him that he can be healed with the blood of Engelhard's children. When Dieterich wakes up, he rejects the angel's proposal. Some time later however, he decides to travel to Denmark where Engelhard, after the death of Fruote, is now sovereign.

Engelhard has a house built for Dieterich and the two friends spend much time together. Engelhard eventually discovers that there
is in fact a cure for Dieterich's disease, and he presses his friend until the latter reveals his dream. After an inner struggle, Engelhard decides to kill his children for Dieterich's sake, and he does so when the queen has gone to mass. He anoints his friend with their blood, and Dieterich recovers completely. When the nurse fetches the children on the queen's return, they are alive and well. The only sign of their ordeal is a red line around their necks, where their heads had been cut off. All rejoice at the news of the miracle. Dieterich returns to Brabant and both friends live happily until their deaths.

A comparison of this summary of the friendship tale in Engelhard with the three streams of tradition of the Amicus and Amelius tale\footnote{Cf. chapter II.} shows that Konrad cannot have used any hagiographic version, or any of the versions influenced by the hagiographic tradition. None of the 14 motifs which characterise the hagiographic tradition\footnote{Cf. pp. 65 - 67, above.} are found in Engelhard, and the two heroes are treated as courtiers, not as saints. Karl-Heinz Göttert claims that the conception of friendship in Engelhard is closer
to the hagiographic tradition than to the poem by Radulfus Tortarius⁵ and there is some justification for this claim. I hope however to show, in comparing Engelhard with the romantic versions, that there are romantic versions which are close to Engelhard not only in the conception of friendship, but also in motif material.⁶ The largest group of MSS of the Amicus and Amelius tradition can therefore be eliminated from our comparison.

This leaves the secular tradition with its two streams: the romantic and the Historia group. Malvina Reynolds,⁷ who has made a close comparative study of

---


⁶ Cf. pp.169-199. My comparison of the romantic versions with the Historia tradition (pp. 70 - 76, above) has shown already that the Radulfus Tortarius poem deviates in several important points from the other romantic versions. Göttert appears to regard it as representative of the romantic tradition.

⁷ 'The Tradition of Amis and Amiloun', Diss.,
some of the romantic versions, illustrates her findings on the interdependence of these versions in the following diagram:  

```
   AN, X*
   /   /   /
 ME  AN, A  AN, B
    
OF, X*
   /   /   /
OF  Vita
```

According to this diagram (which is justified by very sound arguments on Reynolds' part), neither the Old French chanson nor OF, X*can have been Konrad's source, since these two versions contain already some points which characterise the hagiographic tradition, and which are not found in Engelhard.

Some points of contact between ME, AN, A, AN, B and Engelhard, which will be discussed below, would seem to

---

University of California, 1940, p. 136. I have altered Reynolds' abbreviations to my own, already used on pp. 69 - 76, above.

8 Cf. my list of MSS, Appendix A, pp. 206-222, below.

indicate a relationship between these three secular versions and Engelhard. There are however also some crucial differences, as will be shown in the comparison. As not all these differences can be explained by attributing them to secondary sources or to Konrad's own invention, it appears unlikely that Konrad would have used one of these three texts as a primary source.

Similarities can also be found in the comparison of the Historia tradition with Engelhard. The Historia and Engelhard share several motifs which are not found in any other known version of the Amicus and Amelius tale, and they also share a structural feature which is exclusive to them.

My assumption is therefore that Konrad's Engelhard is closely related to the Historia versions, and that at the same time links exist, in the text of Engelhard, to the other known secular versions (except OF, X* and OF). A close comparison of certain motifs in Engelhard, the Historia, and the other secular versions which have not been eliminated will—I hope—not only prove this assumption, but will also clarify the position of

---

10 Cf. pp. 169 - 199, below.
 Engelhard and the Historia version within the tradition of the Amicus and Amelius tale. The following versions will be included in my comparison: 11 The two Anglo-Norman versions (AN, A, Nos. 2 and 3 in my list, AN, B, No. 4); MS Lille 130 (No. 6) and the Middle English version (ME, Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10). Not included in the comparison are the following romantic versions: The Radulfus Tortarius poem (No. 1), because it is already influenced by the hagiographic tradition; 12 the French chanson de geste (No. 5) for the same reason, and the French miracle play (No. 11) because it is in all probability based on the chanson. 13

My comparison of the structure of Engelhard with three other secular treatments of Amicus and Amelius, the results of which are tabulated in chapter I, 14 shows that Engelhard and the Historia version are the only two known

11 Cf. my list of MSS, Appendix A, pp. 218 - 222, below.

12 Cf. pp. 69 - 75, above.


14 Cf. p. 24, above.
treatments of the friendship tale which split the love story into two parts by describing the departure of the friend who is not directly involved in it. All other known versions of the Amicus and Amelius tale, whether hagiographic or romantic, describe the departure of one friend first, and then the love story follows.

The Historia and Engelhard differ from all other known secular versions of the friendship tale not only in form, but also in some motifs. The Historia has already been compared with some secular versions,\(^\text{15}\) when

\(^{15}\) Cf. pp. 69 - 76, above. Since it was the purpose of this comparison to show the differences between the Historia and the other versions in the romantic stream of tradition, it does not contain points in which the Historia agrees with these versions. Some of the episodes enumerated in the first comparison are therefore only starting points for the more detailed comparison with Engelhard which now follows.
it was established that it did in fact form a separate stream of tradition. For easier reference, the numbering of the relevant points in that comparison will be used in the comparison of motifs in Engelhard and in those secular versions which have not been eliminated so far.  

---

16 Some points in the first comparison are not included here. (Points 5, 8, and 16). They serve only to distinguish the Historia tradition from the romantic stream of tradition, and do not add anything to the solution of the problem now under consideration.
1. Of all the known versions of the Amicus and Amelius tale, only the Historia tradition and Engelhard begin with only one friend who wishes to go to a famous court to improve himself. In all other versions, the friends are either already at court, or meet at the beginning of the narrative.

Only the Historia tradition and Engelhard give a description of the king under whom the hero wishes to serve.¹⁷ The description in the Historia reads as follows: 'Erat tunc quidam imperator, nomine Tytus, qui omnes reges mundi in generositate, curialitate excellebat. Vnde fama per totum mundum volabat quod, quicumque bonos mores, bonas virtutes desideraret addiscere, in curia imperatoris inuenire posset.'¹⁸ It is likely that a statement like the one found in the

---

¹⁷ The Anglo-Norman versions do not give any description of the count, and the writer of ME confines himself to the statement that the duke was 'Prys in toun and toure;' (63).

¹⁸ Die Historia Septem Sapientum nach der Innsbrucker Handschrift v.J. 1342, nebst einer Untersuchung über die Quelle der Seuin Seages des John Rolland
Historia prompted Konrad to choose the court of king Fruote as the setting for a large part of Engelhard: Fruote, in Classical and Late Classical MHG literary tradition, represented exactly the qualities mentioned in the Historia extract cited above.¹⁹

The world-wide fame of Titus and Fruote are mentioned, in both traditions, in the speech with which the hero introduces himself at court. Historia: 'et huc veni ad ministrandum uobis, si placeret maiestati vestre, quia totus mundus de vestra generositate ac virtute loquitur.'²⁰ Engelhard:

694 'iuwer lop ist flücke
  üf erden alsô sêre
  daz man siht iuwer ère
  alumbe und umbe sweimen.
  si vert ze Bêheimen,
  ze Ungern und ze Riuzen.


¹⁹ Cf. also pp. 117 - 118, above.

²⁰ Historia, pp. 74 - 75.
ouch siht man dâ ze Priuwen
vast iuwer êre erwahsen.
Franken unde Sahsen
hât erfüllet iuwer prîs.'

2. The Historia tradition and Engelhard are the only known versions of the friendship tale which do not use the names Amicus and Amelius for the two friends.

3. In the Historia tradition and in Engelhard (as well as in most other versions), comment is made on the identical appearance of the two friends. The Historia tradition, the Anglo-Norman and Middle English versions, as well as Engelhard, enumerate the features in which the two friends are identical. Most versions limit the description to one or two features. The Historia and Engelhard give a full list and enumerate the same details: Historia: 'Isti duo, sc. Allexander et Lodouicus, in tantum per omnia erant similes in vultu, in gestu, in loquendo, in omnibus . . .',\textsuperscript{21} Engelhard:

\begin{flushright}
445 Sus reit er niht ze verre.
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{21} Historia, p. 75.
gein im ein junckherre
kam geriten aldort her.
der was gestalt reht alsam er
an lîbe und an gebâre.

464 ouch flôz ein sprâche von in zwein
und was ouch ein gebärde an in.

456 si wâren ungesundert
an allen dingen beide

In all versions discussed in this comparison, the comments on the identical appearance of the friends are made at that point in the narrative when the two friends meet at court. Konrad makes five such comments: one when the friends meet on their way to Fruote (445 ff.) and four when they are at Fruote's court. (663 ff., 824 ff., 957 ff., 1296 ff.).

In one point of detail, Konrad agrees with the Anglo-Norman and the Middle English versions in a statement which is not found in the Historia. Konrad states twice that the two friends, because of their identical appearance, had to wear different clothes so that they could be distinguished:

828 der ûz erwelte kûnic rîch
muoste mit den kleiden
si zwêns unterscheiden.

1300 'ir ein dem andern ist gelich,
wan daz si mit den kleiden
besunser sint gescheiden
vom kûnege zallem mâle.'

This motif is found in AN,A:

25 De cors, de viz tant resemblöient,
Si d'une robe vestuz esteient,
N'est hom el mund k'eus avisait,
Ke par semblance les desevraht;

and AN,B continues:

29 Ne par cors ne par fazon,
Par reen si par la robe noun.22

The Middle English version also contains it:

94 Fader ne moder ëbat coup say
Ne knew ës hend children tway
But by ës coloure of her clop.

Apart from the question of the date of compsition
(the Amicus and Amelius tale was probably not incorporated

22 After 'reen', Kölbing makes the following comment:
(das zw. e corr. aus?)
into the Historia until ca. 1330), the above detail is an indication that Konrad may not have used the Historia version itself as a primary source.

4. Similarities as well as discrepancies may be observed between the Historia tradition and Engelhard in the beginning of the love story. This may be due to the fact that Konrad inserted a large amount of material from secondary sources into this part of Engelhard. In my view, however, a second factor which must be considered is that the writer of the Historia version also adapted this part of the friendship tale considerably, as the comparison will show.

In the Historia tradition, as well as in Engelhard, one friend falls in love with the king's daughter while serving at her table, and he then becomes love-sick. These two motifs are not found in any other known secular version of the friendship tale. On the other hand, the Historia differs from all known secular versions of the friendship tale, including Engelhard, in

---

23 Cf. pp. 77 - 78, above.

that it is the man who first falls in love. His companion then plies the king's daughter with gifts of increasing value, until she finally consents to meet her admirer and grants him her love. In all other known secular versions, the girl falls in love first, and in many versions she forces the man to make love to her by threatening that if he does not, she will accuse him of attempted rape.

Engelhard thus does not entirely agree with either the Historia or any of the other known secular versions. Konrad's poem agrees with the Historia in the two motifs outlined above, and it agrees with the other versions here compared in the fact that it is the girl who first falls in love. Another point in which Engelhard agrees with the secular versions (and which is not found in the Historia) is that the man mentions the difference in social rank between him and the king's daughter. But while this is a defence against the advances of the girl in the other secular versions, it is a sign of modesty in Engelhard.

Neither the Historia account nor the Potiphar's wife motif found in the other secular versions would have

25 Cf. for example ME, 592 - 600.
fitted into the courtly conception of 'minne' as Konrad portrays it. 26

It would therefore appear that Konrad's (and the Historia's) source would have contained the table scene and the love-sickness, 27 and that in this source it was the girl which first fell in love. The writer of the Historia would have changed this and made the man fall in love first, while Konrad would have adapted it to fit his concept of courtly 'minne', and retained the feature that the girl first falls in love.

26 Cf. Konrad von Würzburg, Der trojanische Krieg, ed. Adelbert von Keller. Stuttgart, 1858 (reprint Amsterdam, 1965) where Helen expresses the following attitude:

21628 'hæt ich den willen und den muot,
  daz ich wolt enden iuwer gir,
  sô waere daz vil lieber mir,
  daz ir mir sint von herzen holt,
  dann alle gülte und allez golt,
  daz ieman künde mir gegeben.'

27 In the Anglo-Norman and Middle English versions, it is the king's daughter who is affected by love-sickness.
It should be noted that the Historia and Engelhard are the only known secular versions which utilise the motif of the identical appearance of the two friends not only in the first friendship test, but also in the love story. In both these versions, the identical appearance of the friends creates confusion at the beginning of the love story. In the Historia, the emperor sends Lodovicus to serve his daughter, in the belief that he is Alexander: 'Cum vero Cesar de ultimo ferculo erat ministratus ac saturatus, dixit Lodouico, quem credebat esse Allexandrum: "Fili, ex parte mea istud presentes filie mee!"'\(^{28}\) This visit marks the beginning of Lodovicus's lovesickness. In Engelhard, it is Engeltrüt who suffers because of the identical appearance of the two friends.

6. In Engelhard, as in the Historia, AN,A, AN,B and ME, the friend not involved in the love story has to leave the king's court because he has received news of his father's death. He has to go and administer his lands.

In most secular versions, two conversations take place before the friend's departure: the first when he visits the king to take leave, and the second when

\(^{28}\) Historia, p. 75.
he exchanges the recognition-tokens with the friend who remains behind.

Konrad differs from all known secular versions at this point. In Engelhard, no recognition-token is passed over and the two conversations are reversed (Dieterich speaks with Engelhard first and then takes leave of Fruote). In my view, this difference is due to a departure by Konrad from the text of his source. The recognition-token is a feature of all known versions of the Amicus and Amelius tale, and it is therefore likely that Konrad's source would have contained it. By dispensing with the recognition-token, Konrad may have attempted to 'spiritualise' the relationship of the two friends. He may have wished to portray it as so close that no material token or pledge was required.29

This attitude is in fact hinted at in the Historia. When Alexander receives the token, he comments:

"Libenter anulum recipiam; sed sine annulo de te

29 Karl-Heinz Göttert, op. cit., p. 147 f., advances the same view about Konrad's artistic intention, when he talks about the 'Verinnerlichung' of the idea of friendship.
cogitarem, sicut hactenus feci. Ad deum vos recommendo."
Tunc ceciderunt super collum eius et amplexati atque
osculati sunt eum. ³⁰ These are Alexander's last words
before the parting. Engelhard's last words (after
Dieterich had asked him to come and visit him) are:

1580 'zeware' sprach er, 'daz geschiht:
  nim des ze pfande mânen eit.'
sus bôt er im die sicherheit
daz er in gerne sêhe,
swenn ime daz geschehe
daz er von dannen wolte varn.
ein ander bâten si bewarn
den süezen got vil reinen.
man sach si heize weinen
umbe ir zweier scheiden.
ez wart dô von in beiden
mit trûren jâmer güebet.

Engelhard thus offers Dieterich a pledge, but this
pledge is his oath, not a tangible recognition-token. ³¹

³⁰ Historia, p. 78.
³¹ At another point where some versions (particularly
MS Lille 130) mention pledges: when the guilty
In most secular versions (including the Historia), the final conversation before the friends part contains a reaffirmation of their friendship-troth and a warning (to the friend who remains behind) against the traitor. Two versions differ from this tradition: AN,B and Engelhard. In these two versions, the friend who departs asks his companion to come with him. The latter refuses and points to his obligations to the king whom he serves.\footnote{32} This parallel applies however only to the first half of the Engelhard-Dieterich conversation.

The second half of this conversation (in which Dieterich offers to stay behind and give up his inheritance for the sake of Engelhard) is found in a

friend leaves the court to exchange clothes and places with his innocent companion, Konrad uses similar words: 4186 'ze pfande ich mine triuwe/setz unde ritters êre', 4198 'weizgot der liez in riten/ ûf sûner hôhen triuwe pfant.' 4208 'jâmerhaft und ungemuot/ gap er ze pfande sûnen eit. . .'.

\footnote{32} Cf. AN,B, 60 - 96. Engelhard, 1489 - 1585.
different setting in the *Historia*, where Alexander, in his conversation with the king, states: "Verumtamen, antequam vos offenderem, totum regnum ammitterem."  

In the conversation between Engelhard and Dieterich, Konrad thus seems to be indebted both to the tradition reflected in the *Historia* and to other versions, in this case *AN, B*.

7. The *Historia* tradition and Engelhard are the only two versions which describe the mourning of the people at the king's court when the friend recalled home leaves them. *Historia*: 'Vale imperatori et ceteris fecit; multi de eius recessu fleuerunt, eo quod ab omnibus multum erat dilectus.'  

1600 urloup von im wart genomen
von allen die dâ wâren.
die sach man dô gebâren
vil harte klegelîche.

1612 betrûebet wart des hoves her
von der heimverte sin.

---

33 *Historia*, p. 77.

34 *Historia*, p. 77.
8. This point is not relevant to this comparison. It concerns the nature of the recognition-tokens in the Historia and the other romantic versions. No such tokens are used in Engelhard. 35

9. 10. These two points relate to the manner in which the traitor is introduced in the Historia. In all secular versions here compared, except the Historia and Engelhard, the traitor is introduced before the beginning of the love story. Only the Historia and Engelhard narrate the beginning of the love story before the traitor is mentioned. 36

AN,B and ME introduce the traitor early. The two friends are at court and the traitor is envious of them. When one friend departs, he warns his remaining companion against the traitor. In AN,A and the Historia, the first mention of the traitor is found in this conversation between the parting friends. The statements that the traitor arrives at the king's court as a replacement for the departed friend, and that he is

35 Cf. pp. 178 - 179, above.

36 Cf. my comments on structure, pp. 24, 166-167, above.
lodged in the same room with the remaining friend, are found only in the Historia.

All secular versions except the Historia give a short description of the fate of the departing friend. MS Lille 130, after one opening sentence, devotes the entire beginning of the friendship tale to the adventures of the absent friend. ME mentions that the friend went home, took over his inheritance and married. Only the Anglo-Norman versions and Engelhard, however, give an account of the reception of the friend by his subordinates, and of his life as a lord: AN,A:

152 Kant vint a sa region,
   La gent, ke de sa terre furent,
   A grant noblei le receurent;
   Trestuz li feseient homage,

AN,A, AN,B:

156 Ore peut mener grant barnage;
   Ne ert en li ja si prive
   Ke dis chivalers n'eit de mane:

37 Cf. ME, 331 - 335.
Engelhard

1618  

sus kam er wider heim gevarn
schôn unde rîliche.
dô wart er minneclîche
enpfangen von den sînen.
si liezen wol erschînen
daz er in liep ze herren was.
sîn gelt daz zôch er unde las
gar unde gar in sîne pflege
und lebete sît alle wege
als ein vil hôher fürste wert
der beide lobes und êren gert.

A further point of divergence between the secular
versions is the motivation of the traitor. There are two
motives for the traitor's action: 1) Annoyance at having
his offer of friendship rejected by the remaining friend.
2) Envy of the remaining friend's position at court. ME
stresses the first motive, and mentions the second briefly:

344  

Men blisced him, bope bon & blod,
bat euer him gat & bare,
Saue be steward of bat lond,
Euer he proued wip nipe & ond
to bring him in-to care.
The Anglo-Norman versions mention both motives, giving the second more prominence than it is given in ME:

AN,A, AN,B

180 De sire Amis vus voudrai dire,
Ke fud demorez od sun seignur
E meuz li servi de jor en jor,
E tant com il meuz li servi,
Le senescal le plus l'hai.
De sun bienfait avoit envie,
Mes Amis ne l'aparçut mie.

The Historia implies the first motive, but it is silent about the second: 'Senescalus statim ei locum Allexandri assignauit, ut cum Lodouico in eadem camera iaceret.
Lodouicus hoc audiens, in quantum potuit, resistebat; sed nichil ei ualuit, quia oportebat ut senescalco obediret.
Gydo vero murmuracionem Lodouici percipiebat et contra eum statim inuidiam concepiti.'

Only MS Lille 130 and Engelhard do not mention the first motive at all. Lille 130: 'Or avoit a la cour

38 Historia, pp. 78 - 79.

MS Lille 130 is on pp. 452 - 456. All subsequent
un trop bon chevalier qui avait nom Herdré, que le roy amoit trop, qui avoit trop grant envie d'Amis, qui estoit si pres du roy.' 40 Engelhard:

1662 ir aller sin was luter
engegen dem vil reinen,
zewâre biz an einen,
der neit in hôher êre
sô vaste und alsô sêre
daz er in arges niht erliez.

It should be noted that the statement that the remaining friend serves the king better is found both in the Anglo-Norman versions and in Engelhard, but not in any of the other versions here compared. AN,A, AN,B: 182 'E meuz li servi de jor en jor', Engelhard: 1639 'sô diente er im nû verre baz'.

11. This point relates to the betrayal of the lovers and the friend's reaction to it. As Engelhard contains a much more detailed account of this episode than the other secular versions, more material will have to be considered here than in the earlier comparison (p. 72, above).

references to this version will be to the Woledge Edition.

40 MS Lille 130, Woledge, 452.
The probable source of the scene in Engelhard where the traitor discovers the lovers has already been discussed. In most secular versions, including the Historia, this scene is not narrated in great detail.

The discovery of the lovers is followed in all known secular versions, except in Engelhard, by their betrayal. Between discovery and betrayal, Konrad interpolates a conversation of the two lovers which was probably not in his source.

In the two Anglo-Norman versions and in Engelhard, the initial reaction of the king to the traitor's accusation is similar. AN,A, AN,B:

329 Li quens d'ire feu tant enfle,
    Ne parla mot d'une lüe;
Dunc dist il: "Sire deu, merci!
Si cel traitre m'ad si honi,
Ke tant amai e tant tink cher,
En ki me porrai aifer?

41 Cf. pp. 126 - 127, above.

42 Perhaps the most explicit account is found in the Middle English version, where the traitor spies on the lovers through a hole (769 - 780).
Engelhard:

3545 Der künic von dem mære
wurt dô vil zornbaere
und ûzer mâzen leidec.
ichn würde niht meineidec,
swüer ich dar umbe tiure
daz in des zornes fiure
sîn herze vaste gluote,
wan in sô sère muote
an Engelharte diu geschïht
daz er emohste sprechen niht
in langer wîle ein wörtelîn.
er hæte in als daz leben sîn
gemînnet und gemeinet ê.
dâ von sô muote in deste mê
daz er sô wider in gewarp.

The Historia is much shorter at this point: 'Imperator
cum hoc audisset, commota sunt omnia viscera eius.'43

43 Historia, p. 79. Nevertheless, the sentiment
described is the same as in the Anglo-Norman versions
and Engelhard, in contrast to ME, where the duke,
without reflection, takes up his sword in hot
pursuit of Amis. (805 ff.).
The trial scene in Engelhard is probably also an addition by Konrad to the material which he found in his source. There is no version of the Amicus and Amelius tale which contains an elaborate trial scene at this point, although the Anglo-Norman versions and ME do contain the ritual of the casting down of the glove and the call for people to stand surety for the two combatants. The Anglo-Norman versions furthermore describe the assembly of the court before the traitor formally makes his accusation. Konrad's interest in judicial procedures (demonstrated also in the Schwanritter) may well have prompted him to expand the confrontation between the hero and the traitor.

It is noteworthy that the Historia, MS Lille 130 and Engelhard are the only known secular versions of the friendship tale in which the trial scene is not concluded with the call for persons to stand surety for the combatants.

In MS Lille 130, Amis provides a hostage at the point where he asks for leave to go away from the court (with the intention of seeking help from his companion). At the same point in Engelhard we find several references

44 Cf. AN,A, AN,B, 389 - 390.
to pledges. These are similar to Konrad’s comments in the passage where he dispenses with the recognition-token. There is in fact a similarity between MS Lille 130 and Engelhard in the excuse which the guilty friend makes when he leaves the court. MS Lille states: ‘... et requist au roy pour Dieu qui il alongnast le jour tant que il fust revenu d’un pelerignage que il devoit pour un veu que il avoir fet, et il metroit bons ostages pour li que il vendroit a la jornee pour soi combatre.’ Engelhard advances a similar excuse:

4158 "herre" sprach er, "eine vart
låt mich getuon von hinnen.
ich bin des worden innen
daz ich schieere kempfen sol.
dâ von bedarf ich harte wol
daz ich die sehs wochen var
seinem klôster etewar
und ich dâ wesen müeze
biz ich ein teil gebüeze

46 MS Lille 130, Woledge, p. 453.
des ich vil begangen hân

MS Lille and Engelhard are the only two secular versions in which this excuse is given to the king. In AN,A and AN,B the fact that Amis rides to his friend without a retinue is explained as follows:

448 Car n'ala pas com chevaler,
Ainz ala come pelerin.

12. In the Historia, the day of battle for the friend involved with the king's daughter is also the wedding day for the innocent friend, and this fact complicates the exchange of places. As this feature is found only in the Historia, it may be assumed that the author of this version changed the material which he found in his source at this point.

A further point, in addition to point 12, p. 73, above, is that neither the Historia, nor Engelhard, nor MS Lille 130 contain a dream which is found in the Anglo-Norman versions and ME. In this dream the innocent friend is warned of the danger which threatens his companion. Engelhard agrees with the Anglo-Norman versions, on the other hand, in that the meeting between the friends takes place at night only in these two traditions.
13. Since no pledges are required in either the Historia or Engelhard, the question of whether the hostages will be burnt, and the tension resulting from this likelihood, do not arise (though in Engelhard there is a short description of Ritschier rejoicing at the thought that Engelhard may not return to do battle; 4612 - 4623). The Historia and Engelhard differ however in the description of the battle as well as in the outcome. As might be expected, Konrad makes the most of the battle scene,\(^{47}\) which is narrated in only two sentences in the Historia. There are some similarities between ME, AN,A, and Engelhard in the description of the combat. (The MS page containing this description in AN,B is lost). In these three versions, the battle begins on horseback. One horse is killed in ME and in the Anglo-Norman version, both are killed in Engelhard. In all versions, the combat then continues on foot and the friend is hard pressed by the traitor (actually wounded in ME). The friend recovers from this dangerous situation and overcomes the traitor. While the traitor is killed in every known version of the friendship tale, the king in Engelhard intervenes, as

\(^{47}\) Cf. pp. 148 - 149, above.
Dieterich is about to kill him.

It would appear, therefore, that Konrad closely followed his source in the description of the actual battle, that he made only minor changes (and altered the outcome), and that his source is related at this point to the Middle English and Anglo-Norman versions.

14. In all known secular versions except Engelhard, the motif of the separating sword occurs only once: the guilty friend places it between himself and the wife (or bride) of his companion, while the latter fights the judicial combat on his behalf. Konrad employs this motif twice, the second time when the victorious Dieterich marries Engeltrût in the place of Engelhard. The marriage does not occur at this point in either the Historia or in the Middle English version, where the friends exchange places again before the king gives the hand of his daughter to the supposed victor in the judicial combat. In the Anglo-Norman versions, the wedding between the innocent friend and the king's daughter takes place, and the friend is warned by a voice from heaven that if he marries the girl he will become a leper. On the wedding night, he reveals his
true identity to the girl, but places no sword between himself and her. 48

Once again, Engelhard comes closest to MS Lille 130 in points of detail. In MS Lille, the innocent friend marries the king's daughter without a warning voice from heaven, as in Engelhard. He places no sword between himself and the girl, but refuses to touch her, saying that he has made a vow to go first on a pilgrimage in gratitude for his victory. This pilgrimage is the pretext on which he leaves the court to exchange places with his friend again. Dieterich advances the same excuse:

5030 wiben unde mannen
  seite der vil stæte,
  wan er gesiget hæte,
  só wolte er wallen etewar
gote zeinem dienste gar,
der im geholfen hæte dô.

MS Lille 130 and Engelhard are also the only two known secular versions in which the wives of both friends ask questions after the friends have changed places again. In both these versions, the innocent friend who actually

48 He sleeps chastely with her nevertheless!
fought the battle gives no explanation, but takes note of the fact that his friend has been faithful, while the friend who marries the king's daughter tells her the truth (namely that his companion has fought the battle on his behalf). In the case of the king's daughter it is however not the question, but the answer which is the same in both versions. In MS Lille, she asks her husband how he dared to swear an oath which he knew to be false, while in Engelhard Engeltrūt asks why Engelhard had used the separating sword.

15. This point concerns the motivation of the guilty friend's leprosy. It will be expanded here to include the events which befall him from his return to the king's court to his departure in search of help.

When the wife of the innocent friend asks him, on his return from the judicial combat, why he had placed a sword between them, different answers are given in the various versions, as outlined above. As regards the reaction of the wife to her husband's explanation, the secular versions fall into two groups. The first group comprises the Anglo-Norman versions and MS Lille 130, which do not record any reaction, except that MS Lille states that the wife was 'moult esbahie.' The second group consists of the Historia and ME, which

49 MS Lille 130, Woledge, p. 454.
state that the wife is angered by the explanation. Because of this anger, the wife in the Historia attempts to poison her husband, while in ME she drives him out of the house when he becomes leprous.

In my view, Engelhard may well be connected with the second group at this point, even though Dieterich's wife does not become angry at his explanation. Konrad appears to make a special effort to point out that neither the action of placing the sword, nor the explanation, causes anger in Dieterich's wife. When Engelhard puts the sword between himself and his friend's wife, Konrad comments:

4574 daz liez si dô belîben
sunder haz und âne zorn.

An even stronger statement is found at the point where Konrad describes the reaction of both wives to the explanations of their respective husbands:

5112 den klären und den reiuen
frouwen tet daz mære wol.
si wurden hôher wunne vol
und wart in sanfte gnuoc hie mite.

If my assumption is correct, the reason for Konrad's change was his attitude to courtly ladies. In contrast to
the anti-feminist stance of the Historia, Konrad describes his ladies as 'klâr' and 'rein' (5112), 'reine und edel' (856), 'süze sæeldenbære' (5185). It is therefore likely that Konrad altered his source to make the reactions of the wives conform to his own conception of courtly ladies.

This change in the conception of the innocent friend's wife caused Konrad to make further changes in the material which he found in his source. In all known versions of the tale of Amicus and Amelius, the leprous friend is expelled from his own household by his wife. He thus arrives at his companion's court completely destitute (in many versions as a beggar). Konrad probably attempted, as elsewhere, to moderate the harshness of the original by describing Dieterich's isolation from his court as a gradual process of neglect, rather than as a sudden expulsion by a cruel wife.

17. The Historia differs from all known secular versions, including Engelhard, in that the presence of the leprous friend is concealed from the wife of the healthy friend. However, the Historia agrees with most secular versions in that the message from God concerning
the healing of the leper occurs when the leper is at the court of his healthy companion. The only exception to this are MS Lille 130 and Engelhard, where the leper already knows the cure when he arrives.

The secular versions differ in the person to whom the dream (or voice from heaven) is addressed. In the Middle English and Anglo-Norman versions the healthy friend is informed of the cure, while in the Historia, MS Lille and Engelhard, it is the leprous friend who hears the heavenly voice.

This concludes the comparison of Engelhard with the Historia tradition and some romantic versions. For easier reference, a summary of the comparison is given in the table which follows. The page numbers given after the motif description refer to the place in the comparison above where the motif is discussed.
Summary of the Comparison of Engelhard (E), the Historia (H), AN,A, AN,B, MS Lille 130 (L), and ME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short description of motif</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>AN,A</th>
<th>AN,B</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>ME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Opening with one friend (p.162)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of king (p.162 ff.)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Names of friends (p. 164)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identical appearance (p.164 f.)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Different clothes (p. 165 f.)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Table scene (p. 167)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Man love-sick (p.167)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Girl loves first (p.168)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Social differences (p.168)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Confusion in love story (p.170)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. No recognition-token (p.171)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Warning against traitor (p.173)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Invitation to come (p.173)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Offer to stay behind (p.173 f.)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Court mourns (p.174)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Love story before traitor (p.175)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Fate of departed friend (p.176)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Traitor envious (p.178)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. No offer of friendship (p.178)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Conversation of lovers (p.180)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Reaction of king (p.180 f.)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Full trial scene (p.182)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Pilgrimage excuse (p.183)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. No warning dream (p.184)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Friends meet at night (p.184)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Full battle description (p.185)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Separating sword twice (p.186)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Marriage by proxy (p.188)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Pilgrimage excuse (p.187)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Both wives ask question (p.187 f.)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Wife angry (p.188 f.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Leper knows cure early (p.190 f.)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Voice to leper (p.191)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear from this comparison that Engelhard cannot be, as has been suggested, a free treatment of a known version of the Amicus and Amelius tale. All motifs which cannot be explained either by secondary sources or by Konrad's concept of his characters and their environment can be traced to one or several versions of the friendship tale.

Of the 33 motifs which have been compared in the six versions, Engelhard and the Historia share 10 against the other four versions. Three further motifs are shared exclusively by Engelhard, the Historia and MS Lille 130. In four further instances Engelhard and MS Lille 130 agree against the other versions here compared. There are also nine points of agreement between Engelhard and AN,B against the Historia.

If we take into account the close relationship between the Historia and Engelhard, particularly in the early parts of the tale, and if we further note the points of agreement between AN,B, MS Lille 130 and Engelhard, the position of Konrad's poem in the tradition of Amicus and Amelius may be set out diagrammatically

---

50 Cf. the statements of Haupt and Reiffenstein, cited pp. 1 - 2, above.
as follows.\textsuperscript{51}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}[level distance=1.5cm, sibling distance=2.5cm,]
  \node {AN, \textit{X*}}
    child {node {AN, \textit{Y*}}
      child {node {ME}
        child {node {Latin \textit{Y*} Lille 130}
          child {node {História}}}
        child {node {X* (French?)}}}
      child {node {AN, \textit{A}}}
    }
    child {node {AN, \textit{B}}
      child {node {OF, \textit{X*}}
        child {node {Vita}}}
    }
  \end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

Konrad's source thus would have been \textit{Latin \textit{Y*}}.\textsuperscript{52}

This version would have contained all those features

\textsuperscript{51} My diagram is an extension of that by Malvina Reynolds, quoted on p. 164, above.

\textsuperscript{52} I have assumed that Konrad's source was Latin on the basis of his own statements (212, 6493). There seems to be no reason why they should not be accepted as true. His statements concerning French sources for \textit{Partonopier und Meliur} and the \textit{Trojanerkrieg} have been shown to be correct.
which Engelhard and the Historia version have in common.\textsuperscript{53} The writer of Latin Y* must therefore have made some radical alterations to his source. In view of the fact that Engelhard agrees in several points with MS Lille 130 against all other versions under consideration,\textsuperscript{54} and in view of the fact that all points of agreement between AN,B and the Historia or Engelhard are either also found in MS Lille 130 or else omitted by the writer of this version,\textsuperscript{55} an intermediary between AN,B and Latin Y* must be assumed, of which MS Lille 130 is an abbreviation. This intermediary contained those motifs which would have been transmitted to Latin Y* and altered by the writer of the Historia, while Konrad himself retained them.\textsuperscript{56}

The fact that ME and the Historia version share two

\textsuperscript{53} I.e. motifs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 16, 19, 24, 33 of my summary, p. 199, above.

\textsuperscript{54} E.g. motifs 23, 29, 30, 32 of my summary.

\textsuperscript{55} E.g. motifs 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 21, 28. MS Lille at no point agrees with another version against AN,B, the Historia version, or Engelhard.

\textsuperscript{56} In the case of motif 12, the position is reversed: The writer of the Historia retained it, but not Konrad.
motifs, in which they differ from all other versions here compared,\textsuperscript{57} would seem to suggest that the writer of the Historia version had two sources. The principal one would have been Latin Y*, but in the latter parts of his tale he was influenced by a version (probably Anglo-Norman or French) which would have been an antecedent of MB.

The document on which Konrad based his Engelhard is in all probability lost.\textsuperscript{58} It is clear however that Engelhard belongs to a branch of the Amicus and Amelius tradition which ultimately goes back to an Anglo-Norman

\textsuperscript{57} 1. The excuse which the guilty friend uses when he wishes to leave the king's court (to seek help from his friend) is that he must visit his sick father (parents in ME).

2. No marriage by proxy takes place. The two friends exchange places before the king gives his daughter in marriage to the victor in the combat.

\textsuperscript{58} Extensive inquiries in European libraries (the results of which appear in my table of MSS, Appendix A) have not produced the MSS of any version which was not already known through other MSS.
treatment of the material. In addition, I hope to have determined the place of MS Lille 130 within this same branch and to have thrown some light on the position of the tale Amici from the Historia Septem Sapientum Romae in the tradition of the friendship tale.

Two conclusions may be drawn from these findings. Firstly, MS Lille 130 and the Historia version are by no means unimportant in the history of the Amicus and Amelius tradition.⁵⁹ They are the only pointers to one

---

⁵⁹ Cf. Malvina Reynolds, op. cit., p. 28: 'The Dit des trois pommes and the stories [sic] in the Seven Sages are late free treatments of the story, and have nothing for our purposes.' Brigitte Morgenstern ('Studie zum Menschenbild Konrads von Würzburg', Diss., Tübingen, 1962) fails to take into account MS Lille 130, when she writes, p. 35: 'Engelhards Ausrede von der Pilgerfahrt (Engelh. 4156 ff.) erscheint nicht in der lateinischen Erzählung, wohl aber in der altfranzösischen Fassung L (afrz. 446/9). [AN,Ä] Von hier aus mag Konrad die Anregung erhalten haben, wenn er selbst das Motiv auch weiter ausdehnt.' (Cf. my discussion of this point, pp. 190 – 191, above).
of the two major streams of tradition which emanate from 
AN, B, and which culminates in Konrad's Engelhard. 

Secondly, a partial solution to the problem raised 
at the beginning of this study has been found. Konrad 
did not treat a known version of the Amicus and Amelius 
tale freely. Although the text of his source cannot be 
found, its characteristics have been largely determined 
by the comparison above.

Konrad used a comparatively large number of sources 
for his Engelhard. The friendship story as such, however, 
he took from his primary source, Latin Y*, with few 
alterations. Konrad's achievement lies not so much in the 
re-modelling of the friendship tale, but in the careful 
amalgamation of his primary and secondary sources to 
form a unified tale 'von hohen triuwen'.

60 Cf. pp. 1 - 2, above.
APPENDIX A

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE AMICUS AND AMELIUS TALE

The following list of all the MSS of the Amicus and Amelius tale known to me is based on the list given by MacEdward Leach.¹ Leach's list, comprising 27 items, is however not complete and it also contains a number of errors.

My list is divided into three groups of MSS, corresponding to the three major streams of tradition of the Amicus and Amelius tale which are discussed in chapter II.

1. The Hagiographic Group

All versions in this group are based directly or indirectly on the Latin Vita Sanctorum Amici et Amelii Carissimorum. The following MSS of the full Vita in Latin prose are known:

1. MS 649 (389) Bibliothèque de Dijon, fol. 79 – 87. 12th cent. 2

2. MS B. N. nou. f. lat. 13775, fol. 82 – 86. 12th cent. Incomplete.

3. MS St. Bertin 776 in St. Omer. 13th cent. 3

2 Contrary to his usual practice, Leach has not dated this MS. The date given here is from the Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques de France. Paris, 1889, V, 178. Earlier MSS than this one must be assumed, since the earliest extant MS of the friendship tale, the Radulfus Tortarius version (cf. p. 218, below), already contains some hagiographic traits. (Cf. p. 67 note 8, above).

4. MS B. N. nou. f. lat. 14069, fol. 135.  
13th cent. Incomplete.

5. MS B. N. anc. f. lat. 3550, fol. 146 - 163.  
13th cent. 4

6. MS B. N. anc. f. lat. 3632, fol. 156 - 168.  
13th cent. 5

7. MS 1414 Bibliothèque de Rheims, fol. 35 - 40.  
End of 13th cent.

8. Vatican Library Cod. Pal. lat. 866, fol. 103  
13th cent. 6

---

4 Not fol. 148, as listed by Leach. Cf. Catalogus 
Codicum Hagiographicorum Latinorum, Bibliotheca 
Nationali Parisiensi. Ediderunt Hagiographi 

5 Not fol. 148, as listed by Leach. Cf. 
Bollandiani, op. cit., 237.

6 Not mentioned by Leach. Cf. Bibliotheca 
Roma, 1886, I, 307 f.
9. MS B. N. nou. f. lat. 357, fol. 33 - 43. 13th cent. 7

10. MS Cambridge M 2463 (Mm VI.4), fol. 188 - 199. 14th cent.

11. MS Basel E III 3, fol. 22\textsuperscript{r} - 28\textsuperscript{r}. 14th cent. 8

12. MS B. N. nou. f. lat. 15219, fol. 54 - 66. 15th cent.

13. MS B. M. Add. 18922, fol. 204 - 221\textsuperscript{b}. 15th cent.

14. MS B. N. anc. f. lat. 6188, fol. 48 - 61. 16th cent.

The Vita was transcribed into Latin verse, presumably in the 13th century:

15. MS B. N. anc. f. lat. 3718. The part of the

7 Not mentioned by Leach.

8 Not mentioned by Leach.
MS which contained the Vita is now lost. ⁹

48 verses of it are printed by Eugen Kölling. ¹⁰

A French prose translation of the Vita has been preserved:

16. MS B. N. anc. pet. f. fr. 25438 (La Vallière 86).
   fol. 194 - 202. 13th cent. ¹¹

The following is a free adaptation of the Vita in French Alexandrines:

---


17. MS Arras 696. 15th cent. Franz Joseph Mone (op. cit., 353 ff.) described this MS and printed some extracts. Fragments of a verse translation into High German have been discovered:

18. MS N II No. 167 Stadtbibliothek Eichstätt. 2nd half 13th cent. 12

There is also an adaptation in Norse verse:

19. Paper Codex Am. chart. 2609c Royal Library Stockholm. 17th cent. 13

At Jesus College, Oxford, there is a Welsh prose version of the Vita:

20. Llyfr Coch o Hergest. Early 16th cent. 14

---


The Vita is also found in many abbreviated forms. The following is in Latin prose:

21. MS Graz 873, fol. 199\(^b\) - 202\(^a\). 15th cent. \(^{15}\)

In Stockholm, there is a Norse abbreviation of the Vita:

22. Cod. Holm. membr. 6. 4\(^o\), fol. 1\(^a\) - 3\(^a\). 14th cent. \(^{16}\)

The most widely propagated version in abbreviated form is undoubtedly that of Vincentius Bellovacensis, who tells the tale of the two friends in books 162 - 166 and in book 169 of his Speculum Historiale (ca. 1250). The numerous MSS of the Speculum Historiale are listed in the Histoire littéraire de la France. \(^{17}\)

The Speculum was the source for many later versions. The translations and adaptations into

---


\(^{16}\) Printed by Eugen Kölbing, 'Bruchstück einer Amicus ok Amilius Saga', Germania, XIX (1874), 184 - 189.

\(^{17}\) Paris, 1835, XVIII, 469 - 473.
French are particularly widely propagated.

The following are the known MSS of the French translation of the *Speculum* by Jehan de Vignai, made around the year 1326.\(^{18}\) The folio number indicates the beginning of the *Amicus* and *Amelius* tale:

23. MS B. N. 310, fol. 354. 15th cent.

24. MS B. N. 6357, fol. 204. 15th cent.

25. MS Chantilly 122. Completed 1463.

Also based on the *Speculum* is the account of *Amicus* and *Amelius* in the so-called *Chroniques Abrégées*, composed ca. 1330. According to Woledge, the following MSS contain the tale:

26. MS B. N. 1368, fol. 125. 14th cent.

27. MS B. N. 19477, fol. 136. 14th cent.

---

\(^{18}\) Cf. B. Woledge, 'Ami et Amile, les versions en prose française', *Romania*, LXV (1939), 433-456. Leach does not mention this translation.
28. MS Toulouse 452, fol. 59. 14th cent. ¹⁹

29. MS Cheltenham 6224, Phillipps Library.

30. MS B.N. 693, fol. 102. 15th cent.

31. MS B.N. 4947, fol. 125. 15th cent.

32. MS Chartres 1152. 15th cent. ²⁰

Based on the Chroniques Abrégées is also

33. MS B.N. anc. supp. f. fr. 15219, fol. 54 - 66.
    15th cent. ²¹

The Speculum was translated into Flemish by Jacob van Maerlant (c. 1235 - 1300). There is only one complete MS known to me:

34. MS XX Royal Library of the Hague, fol. 201³ - 203⁴ and 203³ - 204⁴. ²²

¹⁹ Printed by Brian Woledge, op. cit., 444 - 452.

²⁰ This is the only MS of the Chronicles listed by Leach. He erroneously lists it as 1153.

²¹ Leach lists this MS as a translation of the Vita, but cf. Brian Woledge, op. cit., 440.

²² Jacob van Maerlant's Spiegel historiael, met de fragmenten der later toegevoegde gedeelten, bewerkt
A free adaptation of the Maerlant translation is found in the Brabantsche Yeesten by Jan van Boendale (Jan de Clerc) who died in 1365.\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{3}

Based on the Latin Speculum is the Amicus and Amelius tale in the Low German exempla collection Der grosse Seelentrost. This work has been edited by Margarete Schmitt who lists 27 extant and eight lost MSS of the work.\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{4} The earliest known MS appears to be:

35. MS 27 Stadtarchiv Soest. End of 14th cent.

A German abbreviation of the Seelentrost version is found in the Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek:

36. MS Hannover I 239, fol. 240\textsuperscript{v} - 244\textsuperscript{r}. 16th cent.\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{5}

\begin{flushright}
door Philip Utenbroeke en Lodewijc van Velthem, ed.
Matthias de Vries and Elco Verwijs. Leiden, 1863-79.
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{3} Jan van Boendale, Les Gestes des ducs de Brabant, ed. Jan Frans Willems. Bruxelles, 1839 - 69.

\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{4} Der grosse Seelentrost, ed. Margarete Schmitt.
Niederdeutsche Studien, vol. 5, Köln Graz, 1959, pp. 11* - 31*.

\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{5} For the text of this MS, cf. Appendix C, pp.242-252, below. This MS is not mentioned by Leach, but it is listed by Wolfgang Stammler, Spätlese des Mittelalters. Berlin, 1963, I, 87.
Further abbreviated versions of the *Vita* proper in German are:

37. MS Salzburg M I 138 (V.I. J.S. 2 271/6), fol. 226\(^r\) - 249\(^v\). 1443. Verse, by Andreas Kurzmann.\(^{26}\)

38. MS Berlin Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz 4\(^o\) 261, fol. 256\(^r\) - 263\(^v\). 15th cent. Prose.\(^{27}\)

39. MS Munich Cgm 523, fol. 92\(^ra\) - 96\(^rb\). 15th cent. Prose.\(^{28}\)

Another widely propagated collection of exempla which contains the *Amicus* and *Amelius* tale is the *Alphabetum Narrationum*, probably composed by Arnold of

\(^{26}\) For the text of this MS, cf. Appendix C, pp. 253-311, below.

\(^{27}\) A short extract of this MS is printed by Anton Schönbach, *op. cit.*, 872 - 873. The complete text is found in Appendix C, pp. 312 - 331, below.

Liége in 1308. According to Herbert, there are four MSS with this date:

40. MS Vendôme 181.
41. MS Chartres 252.
42. MS Bruges 555.
43. MS Oxford St. John's College 112.

Texte des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit, vol. 16, Berlin, 1963, I, 27 – 34. I have not compared the transcriptions with the MS, but a comparison of the two transcriptions shows that either one or both are unreliable. In the transcription of the first page of the MS, the two editors differ on seven occasions, none of which are covered by their stated editorial policy.


2. The Romantic Group

This is a smaller group of MSS than the hagiographic group. The oldest known version in this group is also the oldest known version of the Amicus and Amelius tradition. It is a summary of the tale, influenced already by the hagiographic tradition, written in Latin Hexameters by Radulfus Tortarius, a monk in the Abbey of Fleury. The tale is found in the second epistle of a series of verse epistles entitled *Epistolae ad diversos*:

1. MS 1357 Vatican Library. Late 11th cent.\(^{31}\)

There are two Anglo-Norman versions of the tale. The first one is preserved in two MSS:

2. MS 50 Corpus Christi College Cambridge, fol. 94<sup>b</sup> - 102<sup>a</sup>. Early 13th cent.

3. MS B.M. Royal 12 C xii, fol. 69<sup>a</sup> - 76<sup>b</sup>. Early 14th cent.

The following MS is listed by Leach as a third MS of the first version, but Malvina Reynolds has shown convincingly that this is a different version.<sup>32</sup>

4. MS Karlsruhe Badische Landesbibliothek 345, fol. 52<sup>r</sup> - 61<sup>v</sup>. 14th cent.<sup>33</sup>

---

32 'The Tradition of Amis and Amiloun', Diss., University of California, 1940, p. 4. I have designated the first version AN,A and the second AN,B.

Only one MS of the French chanson de geste appears to have survived:

5. MS B. N. anc. f. fr. 860, fol. 93a - 111a. First half 13th cent. 34

The following MS is listed by Leach as a redaction of the Vita. It shows however more affinity with the Romantic versions, and it does not contain any of the motifs which characterise the hagiographic tradition. 35

6. MS Bibliothèque de Lille 130, fol. 75 - 78. 
14th cent. French prose. 36

The Middle English verse romance has been preserved in four MSS, described in detail by Leach. 37

34 The text of this MS is found in: Amis et Amiles und Jourdain de Blaives, ed. Conrad Hofmann. 2nd ed., Erlangen, 1882.

35 These motifs are enumerated in chapter II, pp. 64-66, above.


37 MacEdward Leach, op. cit., pp. lxxxix - xciv.

8. MS B. M. Egerton 2862, fol. 135a - 147c. Late 14th cent.


10. MS B. M. Harleian 2386, fol. 131a - 137d and fol. 138ab. 15th cent.

The two Editions of this poem, by Eugen Köbling and MacEdward Leach, have already been cited.38

A French miracle play is most probably based on the chanson de geste:

11. MS B. N. anc. f. fr. 820, ii, fol. 1a - 14c. 15th cent.39

38 Cf. pp. 210, note 10, and 206, note 1, above.

3. The Historia Group

The version of the *Amicus* and *Amelius* tale in the *Historia Septem Sapientum Romae* was very widely propagated, as the *Historia* enjoyed great popularity from the 14th to the 17th century. In view of the fact that there have been several works devoted to the tradition of the *Historia*, I will list only the earliest of 29 known MSS:

1. MS 310 Innsbruck University Library. 1342.


APPENDIX B

THE ORIGINS OF THE AMICUS AND AMELIUS TRADITION

The ultimate origins of the tale of Amicus and Amelius have been the subject of debate for over a century. Jacob Grimm\(^1\) and Conrad Hofmann\(^2\) believed that the tale descended from a lost Greek original. Theodor Benfey\(^3\) and Reinhold Köhler\(^4\) considered that the original was the tale of the Faithful Servitor in


Somadeva's *Katha Sarit Sagara*. Franz Joseph Mone⁵ and Paul Schwieger⁶ proposed the theory that the tale was originally Germanic and related to the Siegfried tradition.

A curious error has become established among scholars concerning Mone's and Schwieger's views on the origins of the tale. When Gaston Paris reviewed Schwieger's book he stated: 'Ce qui est neuf dans ce travail . . . c'est l'idée du rapprochement entre l'histoire d'Ami et Amile et celle de Siegfried et Gunther.'⁷ This is incorrect. Mone had put forward the same opinion 50 years earlier:

Sie [die Sage] ist teutschen Ursprungs dadurch, dass die französische Abfassung selbst dem Haupthelden Amicus teutsche Abkunft gibt. Da sowohl Berri als Auvergne im Umfang des alten Königreichs Burgund lagen, so gehörte die Sage zunächst den Burgunden an. Diese burgundische Ueberlieferung steht eigenthümlich der fränkischen gegenüber, welche wir noch in den Nibelungen haben,

---

⁵ 'Die Sage von Amelius und Amicus', *Anzeiger für Kunde der teutschen Vorzeit*, V (1836), 420 - 422.


⁷ *Romania*, XIV (1885), 318.
nämlich im Gunther und Sigfrith, welche dem Amelius und Amicus entsprechen. Es zeigt sich hieraus, dass die Burgunden und Franken an der Bildung der Sage Theil genommen, dass diese aber vorher selbständig war, ehe sie durch die Verhältnisse beider Königshäuser eine geschichtliche Ausbildung erhielt, mit andern Worten, dass die Sage früher von andern Helden als von Gunther, Sigfrith, Amelius und Amicus erzählt wurde.\(^8\)

MacEdward Leach claims that Mone, following Jacob Grimm, postulated a Greek source for the tale.\(^9\) No theory of Greek origin is found in Mone’s article.

Gaston Paris proposed the theory that the tale had an oriental source.\(^10\) Alexander Haggerty Krappe traces its origins back to an ancient Greek Dioscuric cult which

---

8 Franz Joseph Mone, *op. cit.*, 420 - 421.


flourished in Italy.\(^{11}\) Joseph Bédier does not advance a theory of his own: he merely states that no parallels to the story have been found in Europe or the Orient.\(^{12}\) Gédéon Huet\(^{13}\) and, following him, MacEdward Leach\(^{14}\) have tried to show that the tale represents an amalgamation of two folk-tales: *The Two Brothers* and *The Faithful Servitor*. M. A. Potter suggests that a folk-tale closely connected with a Southern Siberian tale was the original of the first European version of our tale.\(^{15}\) Finally, Delmar Homan has proposed the theory that the friendship tale had its origins in several Celtic myths, which were combined and substantially adapted to form the tale of

---

11 'The Legend of Amicus and Amelius', *MLR*, XVIII (1923), 152 - 161.


13 'Ami et Amile, les origines de la légende', *Le Moyen Âge*, XXXI (1919), 162 - 186.


15 'Ami et Amile', *PMLA*, XXIII (1908), 471 - 485.
friendship.16

This short summary of opinion will show the wide divergence among scholars about the ultimate origins of the Amicus and Amelius tale. The most plausible and convincing theory of origin seems to be that put forward by Gédéon Huet and amplified by MacEdward Leach. It will therefore be discussed in more detail here.

Leach examines the two folk-tales closely and compares them, motif by motif, with the tale of Amicus and Amelius. He then tries to show how each motif was changed and adapted by the author of the Amicus and Amelius tale. Two exhaustive studies of the folk-tale, one devoted to The Two Brothers17 and one to The Faithful Servitor18 had already appeared before Leach published his investigation. Unfortunately he did not make use of

18 Erich Rösch, Der getreue Johannes. Folklore Fellows Communications, No. 77, Helsinki, 1928.
them. They supply more evidence for his theories, as will be shown below.

Leach reduces the two folk-tales to the following formulas:

**The Two Brothers**

1. A woman having no children (and often lamenting that fact) eats a piece of fish and becomes pregnant. She gives birth to twins. (In some versions two women eat of the fish, and each produces a child as a result.) 2. The brothers go out in the world, leaving a recognition-token or tokens \(^{-19}\) so that each can tell how the other is faring. 3. One brother rescues a princess from a monster. He does not remain to wed her, but, cutting out the monster's tongue, goes on his way. A passer-by (a courtier or charcoal-burner) sees the dead monster, cuts off its head and takes it to court to prove that he killed the creature. The princess, against her will, is being married to the impostor when the brother arrives and proves his claim by the tongue,

\(^{19}\) It is a life-token which the brothers leave behind, not a recognition-token. (Cf. MacEdward Leach, *op. cit.*, pp. xl - xliii).
whereupon he and the princess are married. 4. He goes on further adventures (or hunt) and is turned to stone by a witch. 5. By means of the recognition token [sic] the distant brother knows that his brother is in danger. Searching for him, he comes to his brother's house and is mistaken for him. That night he sleeps with his sister-in-law, a sword between them. 6. He succeeds in restoring his brother, who kills him when he hears that he has slept with his wife; later, learning the truth, he restores the brother by magical means. (p. xxxvi).

The Faithful Servitor

1. A prince falls violently in love with a princess through seeing her picture or dreaming of her. The prince and his faithful servant, his foster brother, or covenanted brother, or friend, disguised as merchants on a merchant ship, or disguised as women, come to the princess, or they dig a tunnel to her. The princess is won through trickery and through the efforts or advice of the brother or servant. 2. On
the way home the faithful servant or brother hears
birds (two or three) or spirits or voices conversing
about the dangers the prince will encounter (a
runaway horse, a falling gate, robbers, poisoned
food, bridal shirt that will burn, etc.; the last
danger is usually a snake or dragon that will come
into the bridal chamber and attack the bride) and
the proper thing to do to avoid them. The voices
always reveal that the one who saves the king will
be turned to stone (usually progressively with
each incident). 3. The faithful servitor does
everything necessary to avert the danger from his
master, always incurring the suspicion of the
prince. With the final act (usually the slaying
of the dragon or snake in the bedchamber), the
prince, thinking his brother or servant is treacherous,
orders him to be killed or imprisoned. The servitor
then tells his tale and is turned to stone.
4. The prince is in distress, but learns from a
voice or birds or the stone figure itself that the
servitor can be reanimated by being washed in the
blood of the prince's child or children. He kills the children, and so restores the brother. The children are reanimated by the servitor or the god or without explanation.

Leach discusses the tale of Amicus and Amelius in terms of these motif elements. In order to facilitate comparison, and at the same time to clarify Leach's theory, his own sub-headings will be used below.

**The Two Brothers**

1. Supernatural Birth

Leach holds that this motif was abandoned by the author of Amicus and Amelius, because this tale is about friendship and not brotherly love. A remnant of the supernatural birth is found in those versions of the friendship tale which state that the two boys were conceived and born at the same time. This fact would justify the identical appearance of the two boys. Leach also sees the swearing of brotherhood as a conscious attempt on the part of the author of Amicus and Amelius to adapt the real brotherhood theme of The Two Brothers to the theme of friendship.

Leach does not mention that there are in fact
versions of the Two Brothers tale in which the two boys are born of different parents. Ranke cites several such versions.\textsuperscript{20} One of these, from Rumania, even contains the swearing of brotherhood between the two boys.\textsuperscript{21} The fact that a transition from twins to friends can be traced within the tradition of the Two Brothers tale shows that Leach's theory is entirely feasible.

2. The Life-Token

Leach claims that the recognition-token found in some versions of Amicus and Amelius is a vestigial remnant of the life-token found in The Two Brothers. According to his theory the life-token, which was originally closely connected with the boys (trees or flowers grown from the same piece of fish which impregnated their mothers), became an arbitrary object (water which would cloud, or a sword which would grow dull, if the absent brother fared ill). This arbitrary object then became a fidelity-token and finally a friendship-token.

\textsuperscript{20} Kurt Ranke, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 59, note 3.

\textsuperscript{21} Kurt Ranke, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 158.
As evidence for this view, Leach cites the tale of *Oliver de Castille et Artus d'Algarbe*, a prose romance closely related to the *Amicus and Amelius* tradition.\(^{22}\) In this romance, the departing friend leaves a phial filled with water. When the water turns dark, the remaining friend knows that his absent companion is in danger. The life-token is thus still present in this related tale.

Ranke rejects the idea of any similarity between the folk-tale and the tale of *Amicus and Amelius* at this point.\(^{23}\) His rejection is based on the observation that the tokens have different functions in the two traditions. Leach has shown however that a progression in the function of the tokens from life-token to friendship-token is probable.

3. The Fight with the Dragon

There is no mention of this episode in any version

\(^{22}\) The romance appeared in English in 1518, printed by Wynkyn de Worde. It is edited by R. E. Graves, London, 1898.

of the Amicus and Amelius tale. According to Leach it was omitted because it concerns only one brother, and has no direct connection with the plot of a friendship story. In our tale, the only fact mentioned is that the absent friend marries. In the folk-tale this marriage is the reward for the brother's fight.

4. Petrification

Leach discusses this point under the same heading in connection with The Faithful Servitor.

5. The Separating Sword

Leach claims that from this motif only the episode with the separating sword has been taken over from the folk-tale: 24 'The changing of the life-token to the recognition-token . . . precludes the use of the life-token to motivate the journey of the one brother to the other.' 25

Leach does not mention here that in the related tale Oliver de Castille et Artus d'Algarbe, where the

24 The entire motif is cited on p. 229, above.
25 MacEdward Leach, op. cit., p. xlv.
life-token is retained, the entire motif is identical with the one found in *The Two Brothers*. This fact once again speaks strongly for the assumption that whole motif-complexes were taken from *The Two Brothers* and transferred to friendship tales like *Oliver et Artus* and *Amicus and Amelius*. It is in the discussion of this point that Leach confuses Hartmann's *Der arme Heinrich* with Konrad's *Engelhard*.26

*The Faithful Servitor*

Leach does not offer a motif by motif comparison of this tale with the *Amicus and Amelius* tale, as he holds that only one motif of the folk-tale has been used in the composition of the friendship tale: that of the child-sacrifice. Leach argues as follows: In both folk-tales discussed, one companion is turned to stone and rescued by the other. The tale of *Amicus and Amelius* took the incident from *The Faithful Servitor* because a) the incidents in this tale and in the friendship tradition

---

are almost identical,\textsuperscript{27} and b) the affliction of the one brother in \textit{The Two Brothers} is not related to any service he may have rendered the other. In \textit{The Faithful Servitor}, on the other hand, the servant is turned to stone as a direct result of his saving his master. In many versions of the \textit{Amicus} and \textit{Amelius} tale one friend's leprosy is due to the fact that he helped his companion. Furthermore c) the actual rescue scene which provides the climax in the \textit{Amicus} and \textit{Amelius} tale, is also the climax in \textit{The Faithful Servitor}. The writer of the \textit{Amicus} and \textit{Amelius} tale needed a dramatic ending, which was supplied by this folk-tale. The folk-tale then also provided the second test of friendship (the killing of the children by their father).

\textsuperscript{27} There is an exception: in the folk-tale the servant is turned to stone, while in our tale the friend becomes leprous. According to Leach, the author of the friendship tale substituted the disease because it was a more rational affliction, and because the blood of children was regarded as the specific cure for it.
Erich Fösch has made a careful study of the sacrifice of the children by their father in *The Faithful Servitor* and in *Amicus and Amelius*.\(^{28}\) He compares 15 versions of the *Amicus and Amelius* tale with ca. 100 versions of the folk-tale. Fösch shows that there is a striking similarity between the folk-tale and the friendship tale, but then he draws the conclusion that it was the *Amicus and Amelius* tale which influenced the folk-tale. He arrives at this conclusion by splitting up the scene of the children's sacrifice into six small motifs. In a table he then shows how many of these motifs occur in any given version of the friendship tale or the folk-tale. Because 39 motifs appear in 15 versions of the *Amicus and Amelius* tale, but only 67 motifs in the 100 versions and variants of the folk-tale, Fösch claims that it was the *Amicus and Amelius* tradition, and not the folk-tale, which supplied the archetype for the child sacrifice scene.

The main objection to this view is the consideration that the *Amicus and Amelius* tale was propagated mainly in written form, while the folk-tale represents an oral

tradition. The written versions of the friendship tale would therefore retain a greater number of motifs than the folk-tale. Furthermore, the Amicus and Amelius tale is found mainly in continental Europe and in England, while the folk-tale versions have been collected from almost every country in the world, with the exception of the Americas and the Pacific areas. It is obvious that the Amicus and Amelius tradition, which was spread over a smaller geographical area, and was therefore subject to fewer changes because of different social and cultural backgrounds, should retain a greater number of motifs than the folk-tale.

In view of this it appears that Rösch's views are not necessarily valid, and that Leach's theory, which shows a definite progression of the various motifs from the folk-tale to the friendship tale, is to be preferred.
APPENDIX C

THREE UNPUBLISHED GERMAN VERSIONS OF THE FRIENDSHIP TALE

The three German versions of the Amicus and Amelius tale presented here have not been printed before. They are transcribed according to the following principles:

1. **Arrangement:** The texts are divided into paragraphs as in the MS. Underlined words in the MS are not underlined in the typescript.\(^1\)

2. **Spelling:** The spelling of the MS is retained (including omissions and possible errors on the part of the scribe) with the following exceptions:
   a) Abbreviated words are written out in full in all cases where the intention of the scribe appears to be clear.
   b) In the prose MSS, beginnings of sentences and proper names are capitalised. All other words are written

\(^1\) In all three MSS some but not all proper names are underlined.
with lower case letters. In MS Salzburg M I 138, only proper names and the beginnings of paragraphs are capitalised.\(^2\)

c) In a few cases where the sense of a passage is seriously affected by a scribal error, a suggested emendation is given, where possible, in a footnote. No changes are made to the MS reading within the text of the transcript.

d) Asterisks are used to indicate words or letters which are crossed out or corrected in the MS. Where possible the MS reading is given at the foot of the page.\(^3\)

---


\(^3\) Wolfgang Stammler, op. cit., gives information about crossed out words in footnotes to his text.
e) Words which have been rendered illegible either by ink staining (MS Berlin 261) or by water damage (MS Hannover I 239) are left out in the transcript, and the space is marked with a series of full stops. In the case of MS Hannover I 239, where it has been possible to reconstruct four otherwise illegible words from Der große Seelentrost, the letters in question are placed within square brackets and underlined.

3. Punctuation: In the prose MSS, punctuation generally follows modern usage. The punctuation of the Kurzmann text follows the principles laid down in the 'Grundsätze' of Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters.

4 Here I have followed the same principle as Margarete Schmitt, op. cit., Ingo Reiffenstein, op. cit., and Wolfgang Stammüler, op. cit.

5 As quoted by Joachim Kirchner, Germanistische Handschriftenpraxis. München, 1950, pp. 111 f.
The transcription of this MS is made from photocopies, and I have not seen the MS. According to the catalogue entry, the MS is of the 16th century and contains 315 pages in 12º. The contents, according to the catalogue, are as follows:

Fol. 1r Ascendam in palmam.
Fol. 10r Passio domini.
Fol. 240r *Amelius und Amicus (aus dem Seelentrost).
Fol. 247r *S. Ancelmus.
Fol. 265v Hir begynt sunte margareten passien.
Fol. 287v Van sunten marien magdalenen bekerynghe.
Pol. 305r De sancta mechtelde et fratre ejus Alexandro qui fuit monachus cisterciensis.
Fol. 309r Prophecia reperta Verone in libro antiquissimo.

(Schluss defect.)

I have found that the MS contains a further tale from Der grosse Seelentrost. Fol. 245r - 246v contain

---

1 The MS collection was catalogued before the establishment of the Landesbibliothek. The catalogue is: Die Handschriften der königlichen öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Hannover. Beschrieben und herausgegeben von E. Bodemann. Hannover, 1867, p.
exemplum 6 to the eighth commandment, entitled in Margarete Schmitt's Edition, *Die Prüfung der Freunde*. ²

42. The entries which I have marked with an asterisk are added in handwriting to the printed catalogue.

² Margarete Schmitt, op. cit., p. 233,
De tasthe vinaelene den zed halx unde
hustedene voer ene mit biiu spracht eu
pilenewre te sixe gode vankamer allen
at li hebbert als op. On vragde en
vo he sarm were woorde do spracht
gen als my got plagere mert dest ser fuke
do vosmaade my in husbrouwe en al
myne vreuen hebet my voordreuen
Do spracht Anel. Denvelder dat duene
k schal en mert my hius clete de
myne vrencede usthecere mertgr
er stuchere. Do vosde uelcere biiu
tanche truen en zed plouxe
busandene ne biiu ene sere Ca e
tel to arme in spracht al se bu
in sut were de soa to de ne kupane
Anel. On flegere ene dat het nie
twelckdere deke bii bestrege de
myrteme bloos. So were destagne

su Dornico du Anel "sede do
warkheLeod vorst in •n hebroor
Neterden sver was sixeeren
kader toodene bi de em vorst
was dit sorgeste leenachte sii sere
Ons dages do sif weder kerden
was. Do gick he te bedere dat de k
Kere leen vi lagere ene en do
spracht he tem weende Osebyde
tegalch en up to vi nienesten
des nicht dat in soro mood sel bu
noch se suerie in moedede syne he
serie van spracht. Lere. suere sii dese
maruere en linke sert en myuurch
streekh at de oer reeche truwe
vi he navolot bii bespreke Ann
bir moer bonheuwart maol gesint
Ei va en nuwte devrouwe noch
dat oera sere di woorle was.
Twe kyndere worden geba empelren in eynem lande, de hade got also lyck gemaket, dat
....... den enen vor den anderen bekande. De ene was eynes greuen sone, de ander was eynes ridders
sone. De kyndere dophte de paues to Rome vnd nomde des greuen sone Amelius vnde des ridders sone Amicus
vnd gaf em twe nampe gelick gemaket van eynem eddelen holte. Desse twe kyndere lauenden truwe to
samende. De wyle dat se leue, so en wolden se sick nicht scheden. Amicus vader de starf, vnd heren de enterueden ene van alle gude. Do en wuste he nyne wege vnd wanderde hen to synes gesellen hus, * Amelius. Den en vant he nicht to hus, wente Amelius was gewandert na Amicus vnd wolde ene trosten. Des ne wuste Amicus nicht. Also sochte en den anderen van steden to steden wol twe iare. Vnder des quam Amicus to eynes ridders

* Amicus crossed out.
hus. De gaf em syne dochter. Do de blitschop gedan
was, do en let nicht aff, he en sochte synen
kumpan Amelius. Do motte em eyn pelegrime. Deme gaf
Amicus synen rock, vppe dat he gode bidden scholde,
dat he em drade wisede synen kumpan Amelius. Vnd bat
eme, oft he ene yergen sege, dat he ene nawisede to
Parijs. Des suluen dages quam Amelius deme pelegrime
to ... in snoden clederen vnd to vote vnd was
an dem antlate gestalt als Amicus. Do mende de
\[^{241}_{7}\] pelegrym, dat id Amicus were, vnd
vorwunderde sick sere, war syne perde vnd cleder
gbleuen weren. Do sprack Amelius to deme pelegrime:
'Du wanderst vele lant vmme. Heuestu mynen kumpan
Amicus nergen sen?' Do sprack de pelegrim: 'Worvmme
vragestu vmme Amicus? Du bist Amicus. Cheuestu my
hude dynen rock vnd vragedest my vmme dynen
kumpan Amelius? Do haddestu perde vnd knechte. War
synt de nu komen?' Do sprack he: 'Ick en byn * nicht
Amicus. Ick byn em gelick in dem antlate ** vnd ik

* des crossed out.

** gel crossed out.
hete Amelius.' Do sprack de pelegrim: 'Amicus vindestu to Parijs.' Vnd dar vant he ene. Vnd em wart beiden also leue, dat se sick kusseden vnd helseden. Vnde toghen beide to konigk Karle, de \[^{241}\] entfengk se to synem jngesymme vnd al der malck hadde se lef. Dar na to ener tid toch Amicus to hus to syner brut vnd Amelius blef in des konynges houe. Do hadde de koningk eyne dochter, de hadde Amelius lef vnd he hadde se lef. To ener tid bedroch Amelius de bekoringe, dat he de iuncfrouwen allene vant, vnd dede er gewalt. Des se sere bedrouet wart. Do was dar in dem haue en greue, de was Amelius sunderlikes vrunt, deme sede Amelius syne hemelichheit vnd vragede rad van em. Do bewysede eme de greue vntruwe vnde meldede ene vor dem konninge. De koninck wart tornich vnd vragede der dochter vmme de sake. De vorsacket. He vragede Amelius. He vor\[^{242}\]sacket. Do scholde de greue des vullenkamen tugn vnde kondes des nicht don. Do sprack de koninck, he scholde ene bestan myd enem kampe. Desse mere vornam Amicus vnd quam al dar vnd vragede Amelius desser mere. He bekande et vor
em, dat he der iuncfrouwen welde hadde gedan. Do sprack Amicus: 'So hefstu quad vechten, darvmmme dat du schuldich bist. Men ik wil dn truwe bewisen. Nym mynne cledere, myne perde, myne knechte, vnd vare hen to myner husvrouwen, de ne bekennet dyner nicht. Ik wil vor dy vechten. Wes myd er also lange, dat du vreschest, wo id my besta. Is dat ik sterue, so beholt se. Gift my got den sege, so kum wedder to my.' Dit geschack, dat Amelius ret hen to Amicus husvrouwen vnd se entfenck ene vor eren man Amicus, wente alles dinges he so geschapen was. Vnder des wan Amicus den zege. Vnd wen Amelius slapen gynck, so nam he syn swert vnd lede it twisschen em beiden, vnde sprack to er: 'Berorstu my er ik weet, wo id mynen leuen kumpane bysta, dat kostet dy dyn lif.' Dar na quam em 'yn bade, dat he varen scholde to synem kumpane. Do toch he syne cledere wedder an, vnd de koninck gaf em syne dochter. Desse dyngh hadde Amicus vnd Amelius vnder sick, dat id anders nemant wiste. Dar na auer lanck plaguede got Amicus,

* vores crossed out.
dat he spittelck wart. Dar gynck syn wif to myt eren vrunden vnd dref ene vt alle synem gude. Vnd he was kranck. vnd ouele to rake vnd to passe. Nyn mynsche wolde myt eme to donde hebben. Do moste he wer\(^{243}\) den eyn bedeler vnd ghinck \(^{vmme}\) syn brot van huse to huse vnd en hadde nicht mer van alle synem gude dan den nap, den eme de pawes hadde geuuen. Dar vt ath he vnd dar vt dranck he. Do wanderde he hen to synes kumpanes hus, Amelius, vnd wolde sen, oft he ene icht bekennen wolde. Do quam he vor dat dor vnd rep, dat men enem armen spittelschen manne wat geue dorch got. Do hadde Amelius synen nap auer tafelen vor sick, den eme de paues gegheuen haide, vnd sprack to synem knechte: 'Nym den nap vnd gif gut dem armen manne in synen nap, dat he drincke, vnd gif em ok wat, dat he ete.' Also dede he. Do de knecht wedder quam, do sprack he to synem heren: 'Here, de man heft enen nap, de is vmmaten gelick yuwem nappe.' He vp van \(^{243}\) der tafelen vnd vel eme vmme den hals vnde kussels ene vor synen munt vnd sprack: 'Amicus, leue vrunt, wes gode wilkame. Allent dat ik hebbe, dat is dyn.' Vnd
vragede em, wo he so arm were worden. Do sprack he: 'Also my got plagede myt deesser suke, do vorsmade myn husvrouwe vnä al myne vrunt vnd hebbet my vordreuen.' Do sprack Amelius: 'De wile dat du leuest, schaltu myt my blyuen.' Also dede Amicus vnd denede vnsem leuen heren myt essage ynnicheit. Do wolde vnse leue here vullenkamen truwe an Amelius prouén vnd sande synen hilgen engel, sante Gabriel, to Amicus, vnd sprack aldus: 'Wultu sunt werden, so ga to dynem kumpane Amelius vnd segge eme, dat he syne twe kyndere dode, vnd bespreng dy myt deme blode, so werdestu ghe /244/ sunt.' Do Amicus dit Amelius sede, do wart he beide vrolick vnd bedreuet, wente id em swar was, syne egene kinder to dodene, vnd id em vrolick was, dat syn geselle mochte sunt werden. Enes dages, do syn wif to der kercken was, do ginck he to dem bedde, dar de kyndere leger vnd laggeden ene an. Do sprack he to em wenende: 'O soten kyndere, gi lachet my to vnd gi ne weten des nicht, dat ik yuw morden schal. Vnd toch syn swert vth vnd mordede syne kyndere vnd sprack: 'Here Jesu Christu,
su desse martilie an vnd ne wyt it my nicht, wente
ik dat do dor der rechten truwe." Vnd he nam dat blot
vnd besprengede Amicus dar mede, vnd he wart wol
gesunt. Hir van en wuste de vrouwe nicht, dat
erre kyndere dot weren. Do was ∫244⁷ Amelius vrolick,
dat Amicus gesunt was geworden. Yo doch so gynck
droflikin in de kameren, dar syne kyndere ynne weren.
Do he to sach, do legen de kyndere beide vnd spelden
vnd lacheden eme to vnd en islick hadde enen roden
ryng vmme den hals, also eyn syden vadem, vnd dat
behelden se de wile dat se leueden. Do dankede
Amelius vnsem leuen heren vnd sede desse dinck
syner husvrouwen. Dar laueden se reynicheit vnd
kuscheit vnsem leuen heren, de se helden in eren dot.
Dar blef Amicus myt Ameliuse, vnd enden vnsem
leuen heren went in den dot. Do se beide gestoruen
weren, do leden men se in ene kulen sunderlinges.
Do vel de ene kule in. Do wolde dat volck weten,
wat dat bedu∫245⁷dede vnd grouw s de tulen
vp vnd en vunden dar nicht ynne. Do grouw se de
anderen vp. Dar vunden se se beide ynne to samende.
Also bleuen se to samende in dem dot vnd in dem
leuende. Vnde Amicus wif, de ene vordref, der brack
de duuel den hals en twey.
This MS is in the Universitätsbibliothek Salzburg (Formerly Studienbibliothek Salzburg, where it bore the signature V. I. J. S 2 271). The following is a brief description of the MS:

It is a paper MS, generally well preserved, although fol. 1 – 4 are damaged.

The script of the MS is described in the (unpublished) catalogue entry as 'cursiva per extensum'. The MS is written by a single scribe and it is dated 1443. It contains 281 pages in 8°. Each page contains a single column of text, 24 or 25 lines long. In those portions of the MS which are written in verse, each rhymed couplet begins with a capital letter outside the margin.

Initials are executed in several colours. Fol. 1 – 4 contain illustrations to the first narrative as follows:

1\textsuperscript{v} Christ as conqueror of Belial

2\textsuperscript{r} A group of people. In the foreground Adam, Abraham, and David kneeling.

2\textsuperscript{v} Belial

3\textsuperscript{r} King David on the throne.
Moses and Belial.

King Solomon.

Belial is thrust into hell by angels.

A further illustration is on fol. 259\textsuperscript{v}. It depicts a human figure, indicating the points suitable for blood-letting.

The MS is bound in wooden boards faced with leather. Both sides are decorated with five nails. The clasp has been torn off.

The contents of the MS are as follows:

Fol. 1 The Book of Belial by Jacob of Teraino, translated by Johannes Stainberger von Sprinzenstain.

Fol. 206 St. Albanus, by Andreas Kurzmann, in verse.

Fol. 225 Amicus und Amelius, by Andreas Kurzmann, in verse.

Fol. 249 De quodam moriente, von ainem mann, der do sterbenn woldt, by Andreas Kurzmann, in verse, dated 1443.

Fol. 252 The quarrel between Frederick of Austria and Louis the Bavarian, in prose, dated 1443.

Fol. 260 About blood-letting (with reference to the figure on fol. 259.

Fol. 265 Family-tree according to ecclesiastical and secular law.
Fol. 267 Disputation between a knight and a monk, dated 1443.
Es war einmal ein dicker Mann, der viel zu rauchen pflegte. Er rauchte schon seit Jahren, und seine Kleidung wurde verwest. Seine Familie war sehr ärgerlich, aber er hielt sich hartnäckig. Er rauchte tagsüber und nachts, ohne dass jemand etwas dagegen haben konnte.

Am Ende eines Tages kam der Mann zu seiner Familie und sagte: "Ich habe einen Plan. Ich werde morgen früh aufstehen und auf der Straße rauchen. Das soll natürlich geschehen, damit niemand es bemerkt." Die Familie war daran interessiert, aber der Mann schien sich nicht aufzulassen.

Er versprach ihnen, dass er am nächsten Tag aufstehen und auf der Straße rauchen würde. Die Familie war sehr freudig, aber sie war auch sehr unglücklich, dass der Mann auf die Straße ging, um zu rauchen. Aber der Mann war hartnäckig und hielt sich hartnäckig an sein Versprechen.

Am nächsten Tag kam der Mann auf die Straße und rauchte. Die Familie war sehr zufrieden, aber sie war auch sehr erleichtert, dass der Mann nicht auf die Straße ging, um zu rauchen. Der Mann war hartnäckig und hielt sich hartnäckig an sein Versprechen.
Hic hebt sich an die legend von den czwain heilign: Amelio, ains grauen sun, vnd Amico, ains ritters sun, vnd die warn gar geleich anen tadel.

5 Ain schons ding wil ich hie sagen, vnd sol des nyemand nicht petragen, wenn wunderleich ist czwar die tat, die man euch muet czw sagen no hat.

In Frankenreich ein chunig was,

10 der gar in grassen eren Sas, Pippinius was sein rechter nam, dem alle frunchait wol an czam. in seinem lannd geparn sind zway hercznschone degn chind,

dew warn czart vnd wolgeuar an jerm leichnam also gar das nichts nicht was vnderschaidn
mit der gestalt czwar an jn baiden,
wenn haubt vnd har, auch mund vnd nas,
vnd alles das an in do was,
das was geleich in ainer weis,
alas wie got wolt nach allem fleis.
darzue die red aus jerem mund
czwar nyemt verberson chund:
sy was geleich in einem dan
vnd gie aus yerm mund her schon.
dew selbn chinder, als wir lesn,
czway pruederlein nicht sein gewesen,
das ain von ainem grauen kam,
das ander was ains riters sam.
doch als ich vor gesprochn hab,
got ain gestalt in peden gab,
das nyemt west wer der oder wer.
hort, noch wil ich euch sagen mer:
dew chinder chamen in ain stat,
Lucana sy den namen hat.
sy wurden sich da schon verainen
vnd liebleich aneinander maynen,
wiewol sy nicht czwen prueder warn
vnd her von einem pluet geuaren.
dew selbn chinder, als wir sagen,
die ward man fur den pabst hintragn,
Deusdedit was er genant,
dem liebn got vil wol pechant.
der ward die selbn chinder taufen
vnd manig man ward darczue laufen,
gar edel ritter darczue komen
vnd aus der tauf die chinder namen.
Amicus hies des ritters chind,
als wie ich das geschribn vnd
Amelius das ander hies,
den der Amicus nye verlies
recht gancz vnd gar vncz an das czil,
als ich hernach nu sagen wil.
secht, da der pabst getauft
dew chinder, als geschribn stett,
zwen choph hies er in tragn,
die warn schon mit gold peisagn.
die choph hetten ain gestalt
vnd nichts nicht was manigualt,
recht ainer als der ander was
jn allerweis, so man jn mas.
der pabst ward in die choph da gebn
vnd sprach czu in: 'nu merkt eben,
dew gab ain wars vrkund geit
das jr von mir getauft seit.
dacz kam in der vil werden stat,
die aller welt czw pieten hatt.'
nu do dew red also geschah,
die chinder czugn haim dannach.
des pabsts choph sy mit jn namen
vnd haim czu jerm vater chomen.
des grauen sun Amelius
sas pey der stat Parisius,
sein grafschaft was genant Alfern,
darauf er sas mit grassen eren.
Amicus der sas weit hin dan
auf einer vest dacz Berican,
des vater auch ain ritter was,
als wie ich vor ein wenig las.
der selb Amicus, als ich sag,
nam schan an sich pey tag vnd nacht,
das er ward wiczig vnd auch chlug
vnd guetter synne het gemueg.
sein vater was ain alter man
vnd gueter ding vil het getan,
er was dem liebn got genem
vnd auch an nichts widerczem.
u du do der selbig sterbn solt,
als wie es got von himel wolt,
zw seinem liebn sun er sprach,
der vor im stuend vnd in an sacht:
'mein sun vnd hercznliebs chind,
ich des an mir nu wol enphind
das ich das ellend rawmen scl.
u nu solt du sein der tugent vol.

[227r]
dein trew, die soltu stet pehalten,
als wol dem jungen als dem altn.
dew armem lewt solt du pedenkohn
vnd dich mit nichts von jn wenken.
mit nyemt soltu dich verberen,
vnd trewillic hienen deinem herrn.
dein ritterschaft soltu volfuern,
das got an dich nicht mug geczuern.

des grauen sun von der Alfern,
den soltu habn stet in eren.
du solt jm alle trew erczaigen
vnd dich halt genczleich czu ym naigen,
wenn er sich hat czw dir geselt,
das mir von herczn wolgeuelt.'
als nu der ritter das gesprach,
gar churczleich lag er tad darnach.
er ward auch seinen geist aufgebhn,
der furhin in das ewig lebn,
dort in die englischn schar,
der leichnam lag auf der par.
Amicus hies in schon pegrabn
vnd ward die armn leut pegabn,
die vmb sein sel da pitten soltn,
wann er lag yecz in den moltn.
er tett das recht vnd pilleich was
vnd sich an nichte vergas.
secht, do sein vater was gestarbn
vnd nach dem leichnam verdarbn,
Amicus ward sein hab pesiczn
gar sawberleich mit alln wizn.
er tot recht als ain frumer man,
der allen lewtn guets gan.
er was auch yedem man holt,
als er von recht vnd pilleich solt.
man trueg jm aber neyd vnd has
gar heftichleich an vnderlas.
sein aign leut dasselbig tetn.
dy wurdn ym so nachant tretn
vnd ym sein vest recht angewinen,
das er halt muest hin dan entrinen.
Amicus, der vil salig man,
do der muest nu fliechn hin dan,
dem kchoph er nicht hinder ym lies,
den ym der pabst vor gebn hies.
er het in schon in seiner phlicht
vnd sein vergas mit nichte nicht.
als er nu czach von seiner hab,
dew jm sein lieber vater gab,
gar erber dienner mit jm rittn
vnd dientn jm mit guetn sytten.
zwier fünf der dienner sind gewesen,
czw den er sprach, als wir es lesn:
'wir muesn grasn chumer leiden,
seid ich mein hab sol also meiden,
vnd mag es anders nicht gesein.
seind mir genomen ist das mein,
so suech wir den Amelium,
der ist an allen stukohn frum.

er ist mir holt, das wais ich wol,
als wie ain frewnt dem andern sol.
wir suln hin an seinen hof,
 wenn czwar er ist ein rechter graff.
wil er vns seins guets gebn,
 so wirt leicht pesser vnser leben.'
dew red geuiel den kchnechtln wol.

nu hort, was ich euch sagn sol:
sy wurdn mit einander draf
hin czw dem vorgenantn grafn,

den fundn sy dahaim czwar nicht,
(das was in laid vnd gar enwicht),
 wenn er geritn het hin dan
 auf czu der vest dacz Berican,
das er Amicum trostn wolt,

dem er do was in herozn holdt,

[228]\des vater jm gestarbn was,
als wie ich vor ein wenig las.
uo do er nicht Amicum sach,
Amelius hueb auf vnd sprach:

175 'ich chum czwar nymer jn mein haus,
von dem ich pin geritn aus,
ich mues ee den Amicum vinden,
das im sein truemsal mug verswinden.'
secht, in der czeit geschach do das
als wie Amicus komen was
zw ainen vberreichn man,
der sich auf allew ding versan.
der mann der was edel an der art
vnd het ain tachter, dew was czart.

180 Amicus het dem man verjechn
was vngelukch im wer geschechn.
das was dem guetn man vil laid
vnd gab im auch die jungen maid.
das tet der man halt vngepetn
vnd hies Amicum czu jm tretn,
wenen er jm helffn wol vnd ratn
vnd treuleich chomen im cze stattn.
Amicus also wol an cham
vnd auch des mannes tachter nam.
drew halbe jar er da pelaib
vnd auch dieczeit mit jm vertraib.
secht, darnach ward sich aufgerechtn
Amicus gar mit starkohn kchnechtn,
das er mit jm recht suechn wolt
Amelium, dem er was hold.
der selb rait auch hin vnd her,
das er wolt suechn ymmer
des ritter sun von Berican,
der jm da was ein lieber man.
zway jar ward auch das suechn wern.
u nu solt jr merkchn was ich lern:
Amelius, als ich hie lis,
der rait hin czu der stat Paris.
ain pilgreim stued vor der stat,
der het an jm ein snode wat.
Amelius der ward in fragn
ob er jm ichts chund gesechn\(^1\)
von ainem vil gar frumen man,

\(^1\) gesagen
der selb wer von Berican
215 vnd er Amicus wer genant,
auch guetn lewtn wolpechant.
der pilgrim hin wider sprach:
'des mannes czwar ich nye gesach,
denn du mir genennet hast,
220 wenn ich pin ellend vnd ein gast.
\[229^v\] darczue pin ich ein armer man,
als du wol siechst mit augn an.'
Amelius gar trawrig was
vnd er auf ainen hengst do sas.
225 den obern rokch czach er ab
vnd in dem armen man hin gab.
er sprach: 'nym hin vnd leg an dich,
auch pit den liebn got fur mich,
das mir mein mue schir werd verkert,
230 die czway jar yeczund hat gewert,
 wenn ich denn man nicht chan gesechn,
von dem ich dir nu hab vergechn.'
Amelius ward fur sich reitten
mit seinem volkch czu ainer leittn.
235 sy stuendn ab pcy einem see
vnd sassen nylon auf den chlee.
sy wurden da gar froleich sein,
mit edler host vnd gutn wein.
recht an dem selbn tag geschach

das der Amicus kom hinnach
vnd ward auch reitn czw der stat,
Parisius den namen sy hat.
den pilgreim er sten do sach,
von dem ich do vor ein wenig sprach.

Amicus fragt in angueuer

ob jm icht widerfarn wer
des grauen sun von der Alfern,
den sech er ausdermasn gern.
der pilgreim der sprach hin wider:

'dein spotred soltu legn nylon,
wenn du des grauen sun czwar pist,
der heut pey mir gewesen ist,
vnd hast mir auch den rock gegeb,
got geb dir halt das ewig lebn.

du fragest mich von ainem man,
der selb wer von Berican.
mu redstu, ich wais nicht wie,
vnd pist doch heut gewesen hie.
auch dein gewantz hastu verchert
vnd deine ros sind wol gemert.
darzuzue, als ich es wol enphind,
czwar ander dienner pey dir sind.'
Amicus ward hinwider jechn:
'du hast mich heut czwar nye gesechn,
wann ich pin der vertrign man
aus meiner vest dacz Berican.
des grauen sun ich sechn wolt,
wenne er ist mir vnd ich ym holt.'
der pilgreim der sprach czu jm:

'o junger man, mein red vernym,
nu reit ein wenig fur die stat,
do macht du in wol findn drat,
wenne, als ich dir in warhait sag,
ich sach in heut czwar an dcm tag.'

Amicus hort die red vil gern
vnd ward sich von dem man hin cheren.
er ward jm etleich phennig gebn
vnd trostn jm sein arms leben.
er hies in auch got fur jm pitten,
das jm sein mue ward abgesniten.
Amicus rait also dahin
und froleich was in ganczm syn.
nu do er hin cham auf das veld
mit seinem volkch, als ich es meld;
des grauen ritter wurdn spechn
und fromds volkch von verrn sechn,
vnd hetten das in jerem syn
das sy leicht woltn schadn jm.
sy wurdn recht von schaid czukchn,
auch swert vnd sper her fur druckhn.
Amicus, do der das ansach,
czw seinen chnechtyn er do sprach:
'wir sulln freileich mit jm vechtn
vnd vns auch wider sew gerechtn,
seynd sy an vns mu valln wellend
vnd sich gar veintleich wider stellent.'
nu do sy czu einander chomen,
auch paid tail wurdn sich schamen.
Amicus der hueb auf vnd sprach,
(do er des grauen ritter sach):
'o starkcher ritter, wer seit jr?
das sult ir freuntleich sagen mir.
fürbar, jr seit gar erber ritter,
vnd warumb seit jr mir so pitter
das jr mein dienner wellet vachn
vnd veintleich auf Amicum slachn,
der ettwenn sas dacz Berican
vnd ist vertribn gar hindan.'
Amelius, recht an der vart,
do er vernomen het die wart,
er rait mit frewdn czu jm hin
vnd liepleich ward emphachn jn.
sy würdn von den rossn sten
vnd frewntleich mit einander genn.
secht, ainer vand also den andern.
nu wil ich recht für mich hin wandern
vnd sagen euch vonn jerm leben,
wie sy dem endung würdn gebn.
Des ritters sun vnd auch der graff
die czugn an des fuerstn hof,
her Karalus was er genant
vnd kunig was in Frankn land.
dem dientn sy mit ganczer acht
gar fleissig schleich pei tag vnd nacht.

325 Amicus kamermaister was,
Amelius schankoh aus dem vas
des guetn weins gar genueg
vnd auf den tisch czu trinkchn trueg.
der kunig was in peden holt,

330 wenn yeder man tet als er solt.
sy waren allem volkch genem
vnd auch anichte widerczem.
mann het sew in grasser er.
hort, noch wil ich euch sagn mer:

335 der kunig, als geschrihn stett,
ein gar vil schone tachter het,
dew jm allain geparn ward
von seiner frawn, hies Hildegart.
dew tachter was vein vnd chlar

340 vnd het auf jr czwir sybn jar.

[232r]
secht, an dem hof was auch ein man,
der aller frunchait was gar an.
er chund woll pruefn alle schand
vnd Ardecius was genant.

345 er was ain graf von seiner art
vnd het auch einen ratn partt.
sein trew was ausdermasn chlain,
als noch das sprichwart ist gemain:
ruffus infidelis non habet pleni incelis.
in domo ruffi numquam facies tibi pausam.
des ratn trew ist gar enwicht,
er kumbt auch in den himel nicht.
Do ettleich czeit sich nu vergie,
as ich hab muet cze sagn hie,

350
Amicus czu dem schenkohn sprach,
den er jn ganczer lieb ansach:
'ich wil ein weil hin dan spacyern
vnd auch mein hausfraun visitieren,
doch chum ich, so schnigst ich mag.

355
nu hor gar recht was ich dir sag:
die weil ich pin von dir hin dann,
so soltu sein ein gueter man.
dein dingkch das soltu also schafn
das dich nyemant hab nicht cze straffn.

360
des furstn tachter solt du mcidn,
das du icht smachait werdest leidn.
den ratn grauen soltu fliechn
vnd dich genzleich vnd gar von jm cziechn,
wenf aller vntrew ist er vol
vnd ist jm nur mit laster wol.'
do der Amicus das gesprach,
czw seinem weib rait er darnach.
erner ward ein weil dahaim beleibn
vnd auch dieczezt mit jr vntreiben.

secht, darnach sult jr wissn das
deu weil Amicus also was
bey seinem weib pei tag vnd nacht,
sol sult ir horn was ich sag:
der weinschenkch ward sich ser vrgeszn
vnd auch nicht rechter ding vermeszn,
wann er denn rat pehielt vnebn,
den jm Amicus het gegeben.

des furstn tachter gieng er nach,
vnd sey mit ganczer gier ansach.

des ward er treibn also vil
vncz das er kom czu dem spil,
das er sich ward hin czu jr machn
vnd jern maitum gar czu swachn.

mu do das selb was geschechn,
so sult ir horn was wir jechn:
der Ardecius, als ich sag,
dem pashait wol tet tag vnd nacht,
der wart sich zu dem schenkchn machn
vnd auch der in valschat mit jm lachn.

'o lieber schenkch', sprach er zu jm,
'nu hor vnd meine wart vernym.
gar grasse ding wil ich dir sagen,
die solt du doch nicht verer tragn.
dein fremt Amicus ist entrunen,
der grassen vnlewn hat gewunen.
er hat verstoln gras Gut,
das er da het in seiner huet.
er tar herwider nymermer,
wenn er verlarn hat sein er.

kuse mein trew an aides stat,
das ich dir stet wil gebn rat
vnd helfen wil in alln dingen,
das dich halt nyemt mag verdringen.
mein rat der sol dir nicht versmachn,

wenn ich dem kunig pin gar nachant.
der selbig enczigchleichn tut
wes ich an jn peger vnd muet.'

\[233V^7\] der schenkch ward jm gelaubn das,
wie wol es doch gelogen was.

415 er ward jm auch sein trew dar gebn,
das er wolt freuntleich mit jm lebn,
vnd wolt auch tun nach seinem rat
das pilleich wer an aller stat.
ze seinen trewn er sich verlies

420 vnd gancze frewnschaft jm verhies.
recht in der trew ward er jm sagen
als wie er leicht hiet vor drein tagn
des fuerstn tachter ser geswachet,
vnd mit dem ding zu jr gemacht

425 das do die vncheusch ist genant,
vnd es doch nyemant wer pechant.
der Ardecius hart das gern,
Wenn jm was wol mit chlain eren.
doch tet er nyndert den geleichn,

430 das der schenkch von jm solt nicht weichn
vnd sich pesargn vmb die tatt,
von der man vorgelesen hat.

recht vberlang geschach do das,
als wie der chunig komen was,
das er ward an den tisch hin gen.
der weinschenkch ward vor jm stenn,
 dem kunig ward er diennen eben
 vnd wasser czu den henndn gebn.
do Ardecius das ansach,
er czu dem kunig also sprach:
'o edler furst, hor meine wart,
dew ich dir sag in rechter vart.
dw nicht nym wasser von dem man,
der grasse pashait hat getan,
 wenn er dein tachtter hat peslaffn.
domit jm pilleich ist verschaffn
das er mit schandn solt dersterbn
 vnd an dem leichnam gar verderbn.'
der wein schengk gar vil hart erkam,
do er des manes red vernam.
er sprach halt nichts nicht hinwider
 vnd viel recht auf die erden nyder.
der chunig was doch tugnhaf,
er sprach: 'stand auf vnd nym ein kraft.
Ameli, du solt nicht verczagen,
den vndewnt solt du von dir jagn,
vnd macht du dich der red entsechn,
des wil ich dich czwar wol ergecnn.'
Amelius ward pald auf sten
vnd froleich fur den kunig genn.

er sprach: ' o furst, gelaub dem nicht,
der aller eren ist erwicht.
er ist ein falscher czueetrager,
das ich auf in halt wol pewer.

nu gib mir czeit vnd auch frist,
seid es nu darczue komen ist,
so wil ich kemphen mit dem man,
der hat mich ser gelogn an.
dew lug wil ich auf in peweisn
mit meim swert vnd scharfn eysen.'
der kunig hart die antburt gern
vnd ward den schenkhn des gewern
des er jn do gepetn het,
als wie hernach geschribn stett.

die chunigin, fraw Hildegartt,
gar fra jn yerm herczn ward,
sy namen sich wmb den schenkhn an,
vnd tet das auch in guetem wan,
das nicht jr tachter wurdt verhandlt
vnd smechleich vor dem volk gewandlt.
der weinschenk, als ich euch nu sag,
der ward petrachtn nacht vnd tag
wie er den kamph volbringen wolt,
(als er von recht vnd pilleich solt),
mit dem der jn verratn hett,
als wie dauer geschribn stett.
secht, do er mit dem ding vmb giee,
so hort was ich wil sagn hie:
Amicus der cham czuegeritn,
den er emphie mit gueten sytn.
Amicus ward in liepleich gruesn.
der schenkch viel hin czw seinen fussn
vnd ward jm seinem chumer chlagn,
von dem ich vor hueb an cze sagn.
er pat jn das er jm solt ratten
vnd chomen in der nat cuzu statn,
wenf seinen rat hiet er czeprochn
vnd sich cuzu ainem kamph versprochn.
Amicus gar vil hart dercham,
500 do er des schenkohn red vernam.
er ward jn straffn wundern ser
vnd sprach zu jm, als ich hie ler:
'gar guetn rat wil ich dir gebn,
das dir nicht widt an deinem lebn:
505 nym meine ross vnd mein gewant,
so wierstu nyemant nicht pechant,
vnd reit czw meinem weib hin dan,
doch soltu sey nicht ruern an.
so wil ich tretn an dein statt,
\[235\]
seit sich nu das vergangen hat.
auch wil ich mich czu dem kamph gerechtn
vnd mit dem Ardecio vechtn.
got mir vnd dir gehelfn mag.
nu reit hin dan, als ich dir sag.
515 Amelius, als ich euch schreib,
der rait zu des Amici weib.
des wass gar fro in jn jerem herczn¹
vnd auch gar liepleich mit jm scherczn.

¹ die wass gar fro in jerem herczn
sy het des syn es wer jr man,

wenn seine chläider sach sy an.

Amelius der sprach zu jr:

'n tu e so woll vnd gee von mir,

wenn nat vnd angst mir komen sind,
der ich recht gancz vnd gar emphind.'

dew frau ward sich von jm do cheren
wie wol sy das doch tet vngern.
darczue, wenn man nu slauffn gie,
als ich es nu wil sagen hiee,
ain plas swert lag cwischn jn.

das tet der man nur auf den synn
das in dew frau nicht solt anruern
vnd auch mit jm die hul zufuern.
das tribn sy die ganczn czeit,
vcnz das ein end nam der streitt,

der sich do muest vnd solt vergen,
als wie das hernach wirt sten.

Amicus der was an Jem hoff,
vnd want man des, es wer der graf,
der do solt chellermaister sein

vnd tragn auf den tisch den wein.
wenn, als dauor geschribn stett, 
recht ain gestalt jr anplikch hett 
vnd alles das an jn do was, 
von dem ich euch des erstn las.

545 
wol an dem sechstn tag darnach 
Amicus zu dem chunig sprach:
' o edler fuerst, es ist dieczeit 
das ich sol tretn in den streit 
mit dem, der mich geczigen hat 
gar vber grasser missetat, 
der ich doch zwar vnschuldig pin, 
wann sy cham nye in meinen syn.' 
der kunig sprah also zw ym: 
' o junger graf, mein red vernym:
550 
du solt mit nichte nicht verzagn, 
vnd hor auch recht was ich wil sagn: 
ich swer dir des pey meinem lebn 
das ich dir wil mein tachter gebn, 
ob du dem schalk macht obgeligen
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vnd auch dem selbn angesigen.'
secht, do der ringch nu was perait,
Amicus der hueb auf vnd sait
(wenn an sein sel ward er gedenkchn, 
die er nicht wolt vmb sunst versenkchn):

565 'Dardice, valscher man,
was hab ich laides dir getan,
das du mich so ser hast verlogn
vnd in den champh mit dir geczogn?
des hiestu werleich wol enparn.

570 doch machst u es noch vnderfarn,
ob du mich heut beschonign wild,
vor manigm frumen menschn pild.
wildu dein red heut widerpringen,
czwar mir vnd dir mag wol gelingen,
wann ich dir mein trew wolt pehaltn
vorg Jungenh leutn vnd vor altn.
mein dist wer dir stett perait
vnd auch mein frantschaft unuersait.'
do der Amicus das gesprach,

580 nu solt jr horn, was geschach:
dew red tet Ardecio czarn,
auch ward verschoppn paide orn.
er sprach: 'dein dist ist mir enwicht
vnd deiner huld darff ich nicht.
ich wil dir wol das haubt abslachn,
seit du mir komen pist so nachant.
 wenn ich des swer pei meinem aid
das du peslafr hast die maid,
dew do dem kunig istt geparn,
vnd hab ich das also eruaren:
 wenn, wie dem ding halt sey geschechn,
des hastu selb mir verjechn.'
 Amicus sprach czu jm hinwider:
'du leugst czwar in deinew gelider.
 du hast ain lug auf mich geticht
vnd auch dein er damit nicht\textsuperscript{1} vernicht.
auch darumb soltu pilleich sterbn
vnd gar mit deiner lug verderbn.'
da sy nu das vnd mer gesprachn,
vnd ainer ward den andern swachn,
der Ardecius ward sich rekchn,
alts wie er wolt Amicum hekchn.
 Amicus ward czu jm hinspringen
vnd mit dem Ardecio ringen.

\textsuperscript{1} Omit nicht
er warf den ratn schalkch da nyder,
das er hin viell recht als ain wider,
den man do slecht an seinen choph,
vnd ward in nemen bey dem schoph.
er trat in den verheitn schalkch

vnd sties ein swert in seinen palkch.
er slueg jm auch das haubt gar ab.
den preis man dem Amico gab,
vmb das er hiet gesiget an
dem ratn vnd dem valschn man,
der sich mit vntrewn wolt petragn.
was da geschach, das wil ich sagn:
der chunig nam Amicum her
vnd jm derpat gar grasse er.
er ward im auch sein tachter gebn,
das er scholt eeleich mit jr lebn.
Amicus der wasweis vnd chlueg,
der sprach: 'ich hab czeit genueg
das ich ewr tachter nemen sol.
o edler furst, genad vol,
ir mугt sey wol emphesn mir.
ich leg mich aber nicht czu jr,
vncz das ich meinen frewtnn sag,
die mir da ratn tag vnd nacht.'
dew red geuiel dem chunig wol.

630 hinfurbas ich nu sagn sol,
Amicus wolt nicht lenger peitn,
er ward gar snell hin haim reitn,
Amelio sagt er die mer,
recht wie es jm ergangen wer

\[238^r\] vnd wie er hiet den schalk erslaghn,
das man jm tatn muest hin tragn.
er sprach: 'nym dein gewant an dich
vnd deine ross, reit hin fur sich,\(^1\)
wenn Ardecius ist gestarbn

640 vnd in dem kamph recht gar verdarbn.
got hat mir wol geholfn hin
das ich hab vberwunden jm.
des furstn tachter ist auch dein,
dew furbas wirdt dein tachter\(^2\) sein,
wann sy ist mir enphechsnt warden,

\(^1\) dich
\(^2\) hausfrau
vor der vil werdn Hildegar
vnd vor dem furstn Karulo.
furbar der red der ist also.
nym dein ros vnd dein gewant
vnd reit fur dich recht allezehant.'
Amelius der was perait,
der vardest leicht het gar verzeit.
er czach recht an den hof dahin,
nach des Amici rat vnd syn.
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des furstn tachter er do nam
vnd gar czu grassn eren cham.
der chunig gab in auch ain stat,
in der sy warn frue vnd spat.
secht, darnach sult jr wissen das
\[238^v\]
Amelius czwar nicht mer was
das er wolt dienen an dem hof,
wann er was nu ein rechter graff
vnd grasses guts het er vil.
u nu hort, was ich euch sagen wil:
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Amicus, der gekempft het,
als wie dauer geschribn stett,
der tet sich seines ambts ab
vnd auch dem hofrecht vrlaub gab.
er ward mit seinem weib peleibn,
die hies Ebyas, als wir schreibn.
mu do er pey der selbn was,
als ich wol hab gelesen das,
got sanndt jn einen siechtumb an,
das er ward gar ein chranschener man.

darzue was er, als ich euch schreib,
gar sundersiech an seinem leib,
er macht halt weder hin noch her.
hort, noch wil ich euch sagn mer:
sein liebs weib die ward jm gram

vnd tet das sey nicht wol anczam.
mit ainem trangk ward sy in notn,
damit sy jn wolt gar ertotn,
das er da verdarbn solt sein

239r7

in seiner gar vil grassn pein.
das tet das weib vil längezeit,
wann sy was pos vnd gar verheit.
Amicus, do er des enphand
das jm sein weib wolt tun dew schant,
vnd er jr grasse vaigchait sach,
cuzu seinen chnecht er do sprach:
'ir sult gerechtn einen wagn
vnd mich von meinem weib hintraghn,
auch furt mich von jr hindan
cuzu meiner vest, dacz Berican.

will mir mein volkch genedig sein,
so mag mir werd prat vnd wein,
das ich vor hunger nicht verderb
vnd gar in grassn nottn sterb.
des pabst's choph vergesset nicht,
ir sult in habn in der phlicht.'
sein dienner tettn alles das,
das in von jm gepotn was.
sy fuern mit dem chrankn man
vnd chamen hin cuzu Berican.

die Bericaní wurdn fragn
wenn si do hieten auf dem wagn.
die dienner sprachn an der frist:

'Amicus auf dem wagn ist,
der ist ain sundersiecher man,
wan got hat in geruert an.
vnd darumb wil er euch nu pittn,
gar treuleich vnd mit guetn sitn,
das jr im sult die narung geben
vnd last jn mit euch hie leben.
er ist gar frewntleich her geuarn,
wann jn der vest ist er geparn.'
do nur ¹ die dienner das gesprachen,
das volkch ward den Amicum swachn.
sy wurffn in aus seinem wagn,
darczue ward er halt ser geslagn.
sein dienner ward man vbel haundln
vnd gar mit scharfn slegn wandln.
man ward sy smechleich nacher jagn
vnd in mit warten also sagen,
sy wurdn jrs lebens an
ob sy nicht czugn pald hindan.
Amicus der hueb auf vnd sprach,
vor vber grasn vngemach:
'0 lieber got, genadn vol,
ich pit dich, das du tuest so wol,
dein grasse hilf dew tail mit mir

¹ nun
vnd nym mein arme sell mit dier.'
secht, darnach sprach er zw den kohnecht:
'wir suln vns gen Rom gerechtn,
do ist noch oft ain frumer man,
der mich dort wirt vielleicht sechn an.'
sein diener das mit willn tettn,
der\(^1\) sew Amicus het gepetn.
sy fuern in der Romer statt,
die aller Welt czu pieten hat.
secht, do sy in die stat hin komen,
vnd man das wol het vernomen
das der Amicus komen wer,
man gieng czw jm czwar anguer.
darzue die leut, die in ansachn,
die wurdn in gar schon emphachn,
vnd auch der pabst, her Caustin,
der nam Amicum liepleich jn.
er ward jn grasse er an legn
vnd hies sein miltichleich phlegn,
er lies in chainen mangel haben.

\(^1\) des
wen diser pabst was pegrabn,
Deusdedit den nam er hett,
als wie dauuer geschribn stet,

Amicus in der stat pelaib
czway jar, vnà da dieczeit vertraib
jn gots dienst pei tag vnà macht.
uu sult ir horn was ich sag:

Ein grasse tewrung kom darnach,
das allen leutn we geschach.
darczue der* hunger ward so gras
das manig mensch muest werden plas.
er muest auch sein gewant hin gebn
vmb fleisch vnà chraut, ds er solt lebn.

Amicus macht nicht da peleibn,
er hies den wagn furbas treibn
vnà ward czu seinen chnechtj chchtn:
'wir sulln czw dem grauen sechn,
der mir was ettwan wolbecchant,

Amelius ist er genant.'
sein dienner czam die red vil gút,
vnd tettn auch nach seinem muet.
sy kamen fur des grauen haus,

* Corrected from dàr
do tett Amicus einen saus
mit seinem naph, den er do het,
as vor den sundersiechn stett.
Amelius die weil da sas
an seinem tisch vnd bilpret as.

$241^7$ der selb czu seinen diennern$^1$sprach,
der vor jm stuend vnd in ansach:
'des pabsts choph den raich mir her
vnd tuc das pald was ich dich ler:
den pestn wein den geus darein
vnd trag in auch dem siechn hin.

auch nym der chost vnd hais in essen,
das er mug seiner nat vergessn.'
der dienner gie gar snell dahin
vnd tett nach seines herrn synn.
als er nu czu dem siechn cham,
der selb seinen choph her nam.
des grauen choph den gas er aus,
auch as vnd trankch vor seinem haws.
der dienner cham gar snell hin wider,

$^1$ seinem dienner
des grauen choph saczt er nyder
vnd ward auch czu dem selbign jechn:
'czwar wunderliech ist mir geschechn,
wen, stuend der choph nicht vor mein,
den ich dem siechn trueg mit wein,
ich sprech in hiet der siech verstoln
vnd in in seinem sakch verhollen,
wen czwar den choph, den er da hat,
der ist geleich an aller stat
wiee recht der ist in ainer weis,

czwar gancz vnd gar mit allem fleis.'
der graue sandt nach dem siechn hin.
der selb kom gar snel fur jn.
er ward in fragn angeuer
von wann der choph im komen wer
vnd wer er wer an seiner art.
der sundersiech sprach an der vart:
'mein vater sas dacz Berican
vnd was vor got ain gueter man.
ain pabst hat mir den choph gebn,
got geb im dort das ewig lebn.
Deusdedit was er genant,
dem liebn Gott vil wol pechant.
derselbig mich getauft hat
daz Ram, in der vil werden statt.
amicus ist mein rechter nam,
mit dem ich aus der tauf her chom.
do der Amicus das gesprach,
mu hort was ich euch schreib hernach,
der graff dercham von ganzm herczn,
do er an sach den grassn smerczn.
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er viel vmb in mit praitn arm\(^1\)
vnd ward sich vber in derparmen,
wann an die tat er wol gedacht,
dew der Amicus het volbracht,

\(^{242r}\)
do er fur in geschempt het,
recht als davor geschribn stett.
die graffin cham auch zuegegangen,
von der er liepleich ward empfangen.
sy ward ym dankchn ymermer,
das er geredt hiet jr er,
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vnd sy bey jerm leunt pelaib,
von dem ich vor ein wenig schraib.

\(^1\) armen
sy würdn in do liepleich speisen
vnd in ain schonne chamer weisn,
sy philagn sein von herczn wol.

nu hort was ich euch sagn sol:
der edel graf, als ich euch schreib,
czway chinder het pey seinem weib,
dy warn dreyer jar nu alt,
darzue gar schon vnd wolgestalt.

zway degen chind sind es gewesen,
als wir das habn wol gelesn.
nicht vberlang, secht, do geschach
das ich nu wil schreibn hernach:
Amicus lag in seiner chamer

vnd het an jm den grasn jamer
von dem ich vordest hab gelesn,
wenf sundesiech ist er gewesen.
nu do er slieff vnd was allain,
der gottes engel ym erschien,
sand Raphael ist er genant,
dem liebn got vil wol pechant.
dersebig* sprach also zu ym:
'Amice, mein frewnt, vernym:

* corrected from deselbig
nu sag dem grauen marn frue

das er es willigchleich tue,
vnd hais in seine chinder tottn
vnd dich mit yerm pluet perothn,
so wierstu schon vnd wol geuarn
an deinem leichnam ganz vnd gar.

odu wierst auch alczechant gesunt,
das tun ich dir von got her chund.'
Amicus, do der ward entwachsen,
er ward gedenkn nach den sachn.
do er an sach den liechttn margn,
er sagt dem grauen doch mit sarng
wiee gottes engel hiett gezeichn,
als er des nachtes hiet gesechn.
der greff gar von herczn ercham,
odu er die scharffn mer vernam.

doch ward er das hin wider wegen
wes der Amicus het gephlegen,
odu er mit willn fur in strait
vnd was auch in den tad perait.

er gieng recht czu denn chindern hin,
dew hetten nur drew jar auf jn.
ain schonp pekch er mit jm nam
vnò fur der chindel pett cham.
er ward do wayen vnd auch chlagen,
das es halt nyemt chan gesagen.
dew czecher wurdn aus ym walln
vnò nièr auf die chinder vallen.
dew chinder wurdn do entwachen
vnò yern vatter schon anlachen.
der vatter chlegleicht sprach zu jn:
'ich czwar nicht mer ewr vater pin,
wann ich euch mues vnd tottn wil,
vnd ewr gelechter hat ain czill.'
o lieber got, wer chan vollesn
wie swer dem grauen ist gewesn,
der seine chinder muest verderbn,
vnd hett er doch nicht ander gerbn.
dew helsel ward er in absneyden,
das was im czwar ain grasses leiden.
darzue muest er es sechn an
das grasses pluet aus jn ran.
damit er do ein pekch ward fuln,
vnd auch die chinder schon zuehuln,
recht als baide soltn slaffenn,

doch was jm laider gar verschafn.

dew chamer ward er wol versliessen
vnd ainen rigel fur die schiesenn.
den slussel truerg er mit jm do hin,
das nyemant komen macht czu jn.
dew greffin dacz chirchn was

vnd jr gepet mit andacht las,
dew weil der graff das ding volbracht,
des got mit jm het vor gedacht.
der chinder pluet der graf do nam
vnd czu dem sundersiechn do cham.

er sprach: 'o lieber Jesu Christ,
du hast gepotn, als man list,
das yederman sein trew sol laisten
als wol dem chlain als dem maistn.
es ward gesunt ain siecher man,
der dich da hat gerueft an,
zw dem du sprachst allain das wart:
"ich wil dich machn schon vnd czart."
u mach gesunt heut mein frewnt,
czu dem ich trag gar grasn lewnt.
ich hab getot meine chinder,
das nicht mein trew solt gen hinhinder,
dew ich nu pilleich laistn sol,
wenn er das hat verdient wol.'

als nu der graff die wart gesprach,
aun grasses wunder do geschach:
er ward in mit dem pluet beneczn,
secht, do verswant jm aller chreczn,
den der Amicus an jm hett,
von dem dauer geschribn stett.
er ward recht ain gesunter mann
vnd jm der siechtum gar cze ramn.
secht, do dasselbig was geschechn,
der graf ward in mit lieb ansechn.
er pracht jm her das pest gwant
vnd ward in chlaiden alczevant.
sy giengen mit einander aus
gar frolearn in das gots haus,
das sy den schepper woltn lobn,
der in dem himel ist dort obn.
dew greffin kom gegl jm
vnd des gedacht in jerem syn:
'ey, wie ist das nu czuegangen
das ich czwen herrn siech her prangen
vnd ich czwar nicht gewisn chan
wer aus in baiden sey mein man.'
der graff hueb auf vnd sprach zu jr:
'mein liebs weib, gee her czu mir.
ich pin dein man, vnd du mein fraw,
der ich von herczn wol getraw.
der aber da mit mir her get
vnd auch vor deinen augen stett,
das ist Amicus, mein geleich,
den Christus in dem himelreich
hat schon gemacht vberall.

nu gee hinhaim vnd berait das mal.
nach vnsern frewtn soltu senden,
das sy jr frewd mit vns vollendn,'
dew fraw was fro von ganczm herczn.
der graff trueg aber grasn smerczn
vmb sein chinder, dew da lagn,
von den er nicht wolt der frauin sagen.
auch ward er jr nichts verjechn
als wie den chindern wer geschechn.
die greffin gie hinbaim daranach
vnd wmb die chost gar schon auf sach.
sy sandt nach alln frewnth hin,
das sy vollbracht des grauen synn.
der graf ward in die chirch gn
vnd der Amicus pey jm stenn.
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dem liebn got wurdn sy dankch,
der wolt geheln mag den chranch.
die weil sy in der chirch warden,¹

als wie ich das wol hab eruaren,
dew glokn wurdn schon erklingen,
980
auch hin vnd her sich selber swingen.
ain gras volck hin darzu kom
vnd yeden man des wunder nam
was dings da geschech wer.
man ward in sagn newe mer,
dew got von himel het getan
985
an ainem sundersiechh man.
das volckh ward recht vor frewn tobn
vnd auch denn Jesum Christum lohn.

¹ warenn
als nu die essenczeit her cham,
der graf Amicum zu jm nam.
sy würdn mit einander essen
vnd gottes lob doch nicht vergessn.
auch was der frewnt darkomen warn
die liessen alle vnczucht varen.
sy danchtn nur dem Jesu Christ,
der gueter ding ein geber ist.
secht, do man an dem tisch nu sass
vnd yederman mit frewdn as,
die greffin sprach czu jerm mann,
gar czuchtichleih in rechtm wan:
'ich wil die chinder gen auf hebn,
"das man jm werd cze essenn gebn."
der graff czu ir hinwider sprach:
'dew chinder habnt wol gemach.
nu lass sew suessigleih slaffn,
du vindst anders wol cze schaffn.
sicz hie pcy vnsern liebn gestn,
den ich da gan czwar nur des pestn,
vnd red mit jm, mein liebes chind,
seind sy zu vns herkomen sind.'

* Corrected from wass
dew greffin sas, als sy da solt,
vnd tet auch wie der graf nur da wolt.
darnach der graff ward selb aufsten
vnd hin czu seinen chindern genn.
als er nu hin cham czu der chamer
vnd slas die auf mit grasm gamer,
das er die chinder wolt pesechn,
vnd wie den selbn wer geschechn.
die sassn dort nach gottes willn
vnd wurdn mit einander spilln,
als wie do ist der chinder sytt,
vnd lokchtu sich gar schan damit.
denn grafn wurdn sy anlachen
vnd in von herczn froleich anlachen. ¹
er hueb sew da mit frcwdn auf
vnd trueg sy gar mit snellem lauff
zw seiner frawn vor der gemain,
die bey jr sassen, gras vnd chlain.
er sprach zu jr, als ich euch schreib:
'gehab dich wol, mein liebes weib,
 wenn deine chinder sind genesn,

¹ machen
die werleich heut sind tad gewesen.
ich tottat sew mit meinen henden,
das ich die potschaft wolt vollendn,
dew gottes engel mir enpat,
vnd was des halt ein rechte nat,
wenne mit dem pluet, das von in flas,
ich den Amicum schon pegas,
der ward czuhaunt gesunt vnd frisch,
als er do siczt an dem tisch.'
ey wie gar fro die greffin was
vnd alles volckh, das pey jr sas.
sy lobtn gott mit allen synnen
vnd wurden gueter red pegynnen.
sy sachn auch die chinder an,
was jr da warn, frawn vnd man.
denn selbn chindern, als wir lesen,
ain rotter streymel ist gewesn
vmb jern hals, recht an der stat,
an der man sew gesnith hat.
denn chund in nyemt gewischn ab,
\[246^v^7\] vncz das sy komen jn ir grab.
die greffin vnd jr lieber man,
do sy das alles sachn an,
was gott mit jn pegangen hett,
als wie dauer geschribn stett,
sy würdn grasser cheuschait phlegen
vnd nicht mer czueinander legen.
sy dienntn got mit ganzer acht
gar fleissighleich pey tag vnd nacht.
das tettn sy vncz an das czill.
uh hort, was ich euch sagn will:
Amicus, als ich vordest las,
do der gesundt vnd frisch nu was,
secht, an dem selbn tag geschach
(das wil ich schreib nu hernach),
sein hawsfraw dew jm ward sterbn
vnd gar mit leib vnd sel verderbn,
wenn czwar der teuffel in sey kom
vnd jr das lebn gar abnam.
er ward sey an ein want erstassn
vnd auch die sel aus jr herpasn.
secht, do dasselb was geschechn,
as wir es in der warhait jechn,
Amicus, der vil salig man,
der czach dahin für Berican
mit grassm volk, als wie da stett,
vnd jm der graff gelaichn het.
er ward mit chrafft da auf sew habn,
nvez das sy sich recht gar ergabn.
er nam sew tugentleicht jn,
vnd lies das alles varen hin
was sy jm vor hetn getan
vnczahlleich vnd in posm wan.
gar fridleich er mit jn do sas,
auch weil vnd czeit er jr phleger was.
also cham er zu seiner hab,
dew jm sein lieber vater gab,
damit er guette ding volbracht
in gottes lob pey tag vnd nacht.
darnach geschach in chuerzer zeytt
das sich erhueb ain grasser streyt,
wen Longobardi, als wir lesen,
gar widerstellig sind gewesn.
denn pabst si wurden vil anheczn
vnd auch dem stueill sich widersezcn.
derselbig das nicht leiden wolt
vnd tet darzue, als er da solt.
dem Karulo ward er do schreiben
das er solt mit dem stuel peleibn
vnd hulff ym auch zu seinen eren.

\[247^v\]
er Karalus der tet das gern.
er ward sich schon vnd wolgerecht vnd
mit starkchun rittern vnd chnechtvnd

1105 Amicus vnd Amelius die waren
ped in seinem schuss
sy czugn mit dem kunig dahin
rechtruertichleicht, nur auf den syn
das sy dem stuel des helfen woltn

ds sy von recht vnd pillichleicht soltn.
der pabst gab in auch seinen segen
vnd hies sew nur des rechtphlegn.
secht, do sy zu den veintn chomen,
auch pedtail wurdn sich samen.

1115 man slueg dew Longobardos nyder
recht als die pokch vnd die wider.
ir fuerst der hies Siderius,

---

1 Add geuaren.
dem ward auch gar ein grasser schus.
her Karalus der ward in vachn

vnd aufhin in das ellend slachn
mit seinem weib, in fromde lannd,
das was in czwar ain grasse schand.
vnd was dem stuel genomen was
das gab man jm an vnderlas.

her Karalus den streit gewan,
doch ward verderbt oft ain man,

der mit jm was auf seinem tail,
denn selbn ward das ewig haitl.

wenn, als ich vor geschribn hab,
der pabst in seinen segn gab.
vnd darumb sult ir wissen, das
wer an dem tail des pabstes was
vnd in dem streit auch ist gestarbren,
des sel ist werleich unuerdarbn.

sy hat vor gott den ewign lann
vnd trait auf ir ein schöne chron.
das ist nur die vntodleichait,
von der vns hat die geschrift gesait,
dew Christus wil den guetn gebn,
dort in dem himlischen leben.
secht, in der czall sin auch gewesen,
als wir es in der warhait lesen,
der edel graff Amelius
her von der stat Parisius,

vnd mit jm was der selig man
Amicus, her von Berican.
mann vand sew paid vor einer stat,
Mortaria den namen sy hat,
vor der sy pey einander lagen

vnd warn auch ze tad erslagn.
jr anplikch schain recht als ain glas
vnd auch chain mail an jm niht was.
mann sach chain pluet aus jm her trieffn,
vnd lagen schon recht ob sy slieffn.

daran ich wol gepruefn chan,
vnd sprich es recht vnd niht jm wan,
das Christus sew gechront hatt
dort in der englischen stat,
vnd miteinander sind gehaillelt,

wenn sy auf erd nye sind getaillelt.
sy habn dort das ewig leben,
das got in selber hat gegeben.
denn sechent sy jnn aller czier,
als jr das schult gelaubn mir.
secht, also gett die red hie aus.
gott geb vns dort das ewig haus,
aus dem vns nyemt getreibn chan,
wenn aller veint mues hin dan.
also sprach Andre Chuerczman.

Maria hilff
aus nott.
MS Berlin 4° 261

This MS, now in the Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz (formerly in the Königliche Bibliothek Berlin), is transcribed from photocopies of the relevant pages. I have not seen the entire MS. It is a paper MS of the 15th century, containing 263 pages.

The segment entitled 'We dat sy sych vnder eyn anderen vunden'¹ has been transcribed by Anton Schönbach.² His transcription does not appear to be entirely reliable. The most common errors are the rendering of k as h, and of ij as y. Schönbach also appears to have overlooked a number of abbreviations.

---

¹ Cf. pp. 317 - 320, below.
maacht ind he wint se Luitard ynd Suellste in every
beest ynd um oeye Scheders oerde de Humarper na
schetsrijsse of aps met dode luidne ind dat kichtig
geen-ssy die in cee dat ynd de greve han se in si amte
huy grossy brach ind tate se yd dey ploos some.c.
Ind soms premmere die yde l. Guifffs want en
huyt hond de jeh gebert kare van ghesf de ezel
de leye m jnd amic te gernget ynt de Aclade
Alger na hoys ameig ynt Suem Guifffs Luitarde
registrus ynd in den streep fandcheet cem de
Guifffs amic yndde fene baas wan was gernget
van den baas ynd jnd de aert fandcheet ind demes
Vnderste s ynt krasse ynd schuwen de Aclade Con
tam als lange als se noch ongaste vanwille ende
happend de gendemen ynd lyst te y alle m jnd
Ind was de alle de zijn bens leye ynt se wynt.
\[ \sqrt{256} \]

He begynt de historie van den zwen bilgen gesellichen vrunden Amico vnd Amelio.

In der zijt Constantini, des veirden roynschens koeniecks, jnd Pipini, des * koenyncks van Franckrich, wurden geboren ij kynder, de in wunderlicher wyssen sich in allen gelichöen. Der eyne was eyns greuen son van Albernen jnd der ander was eyns rytters son van Britannien. Desz zwayne wairden van eren alderen braicht zo Roeme, dat man sy alle da dauffen soulde. Jnd sy quamen zo samen in eyn stat, geheischen Lucia, jnd alle da verbunden sy sich zo samen in ewicher truwen jnd fruntschaff. Jnd also groesse lieffde vnd eynheit des willen was tuschen in beyden, dat eyne sunder den anderen geyn spise nemen en woult, noch noch in eynre anderen

* de crossed out
slaiffkameren resten. Sy wairden gecufft van deme païs jnd he gaff des greuen son den naemen Amelius jnd des rytters soene den namen Amicus. Jnd de vylheit der roemscher ritter hoeuen sy myt groesser vrouden vss der douffen. Jnd der paiss deede maken ij kostlicher neffen van goilde jnd perlen, de beide gelich waren van * graissheit jnd van werden. Jnd he gaff eyen eicklichen eynen jnd sprach: \(256^Y\) 'Nempt dese gaue, jnd sy sy uch in eyn ewich gezuge, dat ich uch gedaufft han in der kirchen sent Salvatoirs.' Jnd sy ymfeyncken de gaue myt dankberheit jnd keirden weder zo eren eygenen.

Van dem ellende des ritters Amici, jnd van dem doide syns vaders.

Als Amicus nu komen was zo synen . . . . merichen yaren, so hait yn got gezeirt myt also groesser wysshat, als off he were der ander Salomon. Jnd als he alt was nun yair jnd syn vader ertzunt zo grossem alder komen was, so wart he begriffen myt

* word crossed out
eynre kranckht. Jnd want he eyn hillich man was, so
tuyff he zo eme synen son Amico jnd vermaynde yn,
de rytterschaff zo oeuuen, den gelouuen den heren zo
halden, den vrunden hulppe zo dayn jnd de werck
der barmhertzicht zo oeuuen jnd in geynre wyss zo
vergessen des greuen van Albernen. Jnd na desen
worden verschede der alde in vreden jnd syn son
Amicus begraiff yn eirlichen. Neyt lange der na
begunten de boesse mynschen zo benyden den
jungelynck jnd bereyten eme heynlichen \[257^r_7\]
mencherley lags. Sunder he mynde sy alle jnd
verdRaëge geduldenclichen de vnrechte, de eme
angedain wairden. Auer de baissh der baissen waess
also sere vntgain yn, also dat sy yn verdreuen van
der buorch syns vederlichen erffs myt alle syme
huissgesynde. Do nam he myt eme ii van synen
knechten jnd sprach zo yn: 'Daynt wir snellenencilichen
zo dem hoeff des greuen Amelij, vilicht he sal vns
noch rich machen van * synen goeden. Anders wyllen

* myt crossed out.
wir gain zo * Hildegardem, zo der huissfrauwen des
doenvyncks Karoli, de alle wege den verwarpenen zo
raiden plat.' Alsus gaynde, quaemen sy zo deme hoeue
des greuen Amelij, sunder sy en vunden synre alle
da net, want Amelius was vas geuiren zo Britannien,
vmb zo visiteren den seluen Amicum jnd in zo
troisten van deme doide syns 1 Jnd als **
Amelius Amicum auch in symé heymaeede not en vant,
schede he betraifft ewech. Jnd he upsatte, nummer
weder in syn lant zo keren, he en hette Amicum
vunden. Jnd Amicus en hairt neit vp myt den synen
Amelium zo soichen, bis also lange, dat he quam in
eyne edelen mans huiss zo herbrigen. Jnd as der
edel man hoirt sy quait euenture, so gaff 1-257^7
he eme willenclichen syn dochter zo eynre huissfrauwen.

We dat sy sych vnder eyn anderen vunden.

Do nu jj jair vmbkommen was, so ylde Amicus myt

* Hilge crossed out 1 Add vaders.
** ji crossed out
pilgrum etzliche pennynck jnd batte yn, dat he in
de kirch geynck jnd got vur in bede. Do sprach der
pilgrim: 'Ganck snollichchen zo Parijss, jnd als jch
hoffen, salstu alle da vynden den du soichs.' Van
stunt an geynck Amicus yntgain Parijss jnd vant
Amelium myt den synen in eynre groynre weyden sytzen
ind essen. Wilche,als sy sagen de van Brittannien,
stuntten sy alzo hantz vp jnd annamen ir wapen jnd
lieffen in yntgain. Duer Amicus sterckde de syn zo
dem stryde, wenende sy zo syn rytter van Parijss, de
sy angayn woulden. Jnd sy yntgain leiffen sych myt
yntloisten zoumen, sy vprichten de sper, sy vsszogen
de swerder, also dat iure geyn meynt zo yntgann.
Als nu anstaynde was dat perickel des doitz, got,
der alle dynck wysslichen schickt, dede sy vp beiden
ziden still stayn. Do sprach Amicus: 'Wann syt ir,
alre starckste ritter, de den ellendigen Amicum myt
den synen wilt verslaim?' Zo des stymmen wart
Amelius sych verwunderende jnd vortende jnd
bekante Amicum. Jnd alzo hantz stegen sy van eren
perden jnd vmt veynngen sych jnd kussden sych jnd
saichten goede \(-256^7\) vngemessenen danck van yrre
vyndungen. Jnd sy geloffden geloumen vnder sych
jnd quam samen zo dem hoeue des konyncks Karoli.

Van der sunden Amelij jnd van deme verretteriss
Harderici.

Dese zwene alre schoynste jungelynck, wyse jnd
sedich jnd alre gelicheste in allen dyngen, wairden
in deme koenyncklichen hoeue ser gemynt jnd geeirt.
Jnd der koenynck satte Amicum zo bewairen synen
schatz jnd Amelium maichde he synen spissdregier.
Als nu dry jair vmbkommen waren, sprach Amicus zo
Amelium: 'Ich wille vsstrechen zo * visenteren myn
huissvrauwe. Jnd also balde jch kan, sal ich weder
keren. Euer blyue du he in dem koenyncklichen hoeue
jnd hoede dich vair des koenyncks dochter jnd
alremeist van der beoereichlichen vrantschaft des alren
schalcksten greuen Harderici.' Jnd als Amelius eme
dit gelofft hatte zo doyn, so schede Amicus e van
eme jnd zoich synen wech. Neit lange derna wapp

* beseyn vmb crossed out
Amelius syn augen up des koenyncks dochter jnd also balde he maicht, bekant he sy. He yntbynnен der verreden Hardericus, der sych in der baissht ervrouwede jnd syn bepraissticht \( ^{259r7} \) benyde, sprach Amelium alsus an: 'Alre lieffste, du en weyss neit, dat Amicus gestollen hait den schatz des konyncks jnd dar vmb gevlouwen is. Her vmb, so ganck nu an myt myr dat verbunt der vruntschaft jnd jntfanck mynen gelauuen vp den heiltunmen der hilgen.' Als dit gescheit was, so yntsach sych Amelius neit, eme zo offenbaren syn heynllicht. . Vp eynen dach, als Amelius deme koenynck wasser gaff vp syn hende, sprach Hardericus: 'O koenynck, neit en wyll dat wasser nemen van der hant des sunders, want he is me wirdich des diotiz dan der eren, want he hait dynre dochter genomen de blome der junferschaft.' Zo desen worden wart Amelius beuende jnd he veyl neder jnd en maicht neit antweren. Euer der koenynck hoeue yn gecertenlichen vp jnd sprach: 'O Ameli, en wyll dich neit vortte. Stant vp ind beschirme dich menlichen van desem quaedan geruicht.' Do stunt Amelius vp ind sprach: 'Alre rechtuerdichste koenynck,
neit en wyll gelouuen den lugenafttichen worden *
des verreders Harderici, sunder verleyyn myr spatium
des beraitz jnd jch sal dayn eynen kamp vur dir **
von desem b. geruicht jnd sal yn verwynnen van der
lugen by staynde dem gantzen koenyncklichen hoeue."
Jnd als eme der koenynck dat guynt, so yntfeynck de
koenynckyn \[\text{259}\] Hildegardis, de sach Amelij zo
beschirmen. Jnd als *** Amelius vast raide, fragende
was van ir, seyt, so quam Amicus weder zo dem hoeue
des koenyncks. Jnd Amelius veyl eme zo voess jnd
sprach: 'O eynich hoffen myns heils! Jch en han dir
den gelouuen neit gehalden, want jch byn gewallen
in de sunde van des koenyncks dochter. Jnd jch han
eynen kamp angenommen myt dem valschen Harderico.'
Jnd als Amicus Amelium her vmb gestraifft hatte,
sprach he: 'Verwandelen wir nu vnse cleider, pert
jnd wapen, jnd ganck duf zo myem huiss jnd jch sal
myt der hulppen gotz den striyt dayn myt Harderico.

---

* H crossed out
** d crossed out
*** he crossed out
Sunder hoide dich, dattu myn huissfrauwe neit en beroirs.' Als sy nu van eyn anderen gescheiden waren, geynck Amicus zo dem koenyncklichen hoeue vnder der gedaynden Amelij jnd Amelius geynck zo dem huiss Amici jn der gedaynden Amici. Jnd as yn de huissvrauwe Amici sach, geloichte sy yn zo syn yren man jnd woulde yn kussen. Do sprach Amelius zo ir: 'Ganck van myr, want de ziju des schriens steyt nu an ind neit der vrauden.'

Des auentz, als he zo bedde geynck, laichte he eyn bloese swert tuschen ir jnd eme jnd sprach: 'Suich, dattu myr neit en geneicks, off du wirtz steruen in desem swerde.' Jnd also ourbraichtcn sy $260^7$ de ander naichten. Hir yntbynnten, Amicus, angedayn myt den cleyderen Amelij, geynck inn zo dem koenynck jnd offerde sych zo stryden yntgain Hardericum, * vmb dat b geruicht. Do sprach der koenynck zo eme: 'Greue, neit en wyll dich vortt, want off du de verwynnunge vertyrchs, so sal jch dir myn dochter gueen zo eynre huissfrauwen'. ** Des morgens zo der eirsten oren, geyncken Hardericus jnd Amicus vss in dat velt, in der yntgain . . dicht des koenyncks jnd des gantzen

---

* Three letters crossed out

** Euer crossed out
voelcks van Parijss. Auer Amicus, want he van goeder ußsaneaen was, sprach alsus Hardericum an: 'O greue, du hais angenomen eynen sere gecken rayt, dattu mynen doyt also ernstich begers jnd dich also vnwisslichen vnderwirps dem perikel des doitz. Sunder off du de * sunde, de du myr velschlichen vp sais, wedersprechen woultz jnd begenen den verderfflichen stryt, so saluttu verkrychen myn vruntschaff jnd mynen deynst.' Zo desen worden antworte Hardericus ser . . . . . . , dat he synre vruntschaff noch syns deynstz neit en aichde, sunder dat he eme syn hauft nemen woulde. Jnd he swair, dat he des koenyncks dochter beslaiffen hette, jnd Amicus swair, dat Hardericus gelogen hette. Jnd als sy alsus streden, wart Hardericus verwunnen jnd Amicus sloich eme off syn hauft. Jnd \[260V7\] alzohantz gaff he eme der koenynck syn dochter, de da verloist was van also quadem geruicht. Jnd na seden ** gaff he yn eyn stat, da sy woenen soulden.

* valsche crossed out

** der stat crossed out
Als dat gescheit was, ylde Amicus vroelichen zo syem huiss, da Amelian was, jnd saicht eme: 'Suich, jch han dich gewrochen van dem verreder jnd han dir verkregen des koenyncks dochter zo eynre huissfrauwen.' Wilche Amelian wederkerende nam jnd * bleue woende in der vurgesaichten stat.

Als nu Amicus woynde by synre huissfrauwen, so wart he geslagen myt der suichden der vssetzicht, also ser, dat he neit vpstayn en moicht van syem bedde. Jnd darzo hassde yn syn huissfrauwe also ser, dat sy yn duch woulde verstycken. Do reiff he zo eme zwenc synre knecht jnd sprach: 'Brengt mich van der hant mynre huissfrauwen jnd nempt heynlichen mynen napp jnd brengt mich zo ** der burch Beritanum.' Jnd als sy dat gedayn hatten, quamen sy eme yntgain van der buirch jnd vraichden, wer der kranckle wer, den sy alle da braichten. Jnd Amicus antworde: 'Jt is Amicus, ure her, der geslagen is myt [261] der vssetzicht jnd zo uch kumpt, vp

* woyn crossed out.

** b crossed out.
dat ir synre erbarmt.' Sunder de boesen, als sy dit
hoirten, sloegen sy de knecht jnd wairppen Amicum
vern ewech, dreuwend in myt dem doit, were it dat
sy sulche dynck me spregen. Da vssbrach Amicus in vyl
trene jnd sprach: 'O alre mylste got, antwer gyff myr
den doit, off rick myr ellendigem de hulpe der
barmherzicht*.' Her na deede he sych brengen zo
Roeme. Jnd als he dar quam, so yntgain lieffe eme
der paiss, usstanting myt vyl ritteren, wilch paiss
yn gedoufft hatte. Jnd he erboede eme ** jnd den
synen vyl deynsten der mynschlicht. Euer na dryn
jaren gewert eyn also groess hunger in der stat van
Roeme, also dat der vader verdreyff synen son. Do
geynck he van dan, anermytz getwanth synre knecht.
Jnd he deede sych leyden zo dem huiss des greuen
Amelij. Jnd *** als he dar komen was, slaich he de
taiffel na wisen sulcher krancker. Jnd als der
greue de taiffel hoirt, sprach he zo eyne van synen
knechten: 'Nym broit vnd vleisch jnd **** guss den

* corrected from barmherlicht
** my crossed out
*** he ... slaige de taiffel crossed out
**** vusse crossed out
alren besten wyn in mynen roymischen napp jnd gyff it
dem krancken. 'Der dener ervault dat gebot jnd
keirde weder \[261\] jnd sprach: 'Her, durrrch mynen
gelouuen. Wer it, dat jch uren napp neit en heilt
in mynre hant, jch geloicht den napp ure zo syn, den
der krancke hait, want sy werden beide geseyn van
gelicher graijsshot jnd schaynht.' Do geboit der
greue, dat man yn alzohantz in lese. Jnd he vraichde
yn, wan he wer jnd wa he sulchen napp kregen hette.
Jnd Amicus antworde, dat he burdich wer van der
burch Beritano jnd dat he zo Rome de douff jnd auch
den napp yntfangen hette. Do bekant yn der greue zo
syn Amicum, synen gesellen, der in van dem doide
erloist hatte jnd eme des koenyncks dochter
verkregen hatte. Jnd he warpp sich vp yn, roiffende
jnd schriende, jnd vmbhelssde in jnd kussde yn. Jnd
syn huissvrouwe quam eme auch vntgain gelouffen myt
yntlaisten hairen jnd beschrey yn ser, gedenckende,
we menlichen he bestreden hatte den vereder Hardericum.
Zo dem lestten leyttten sy yn in eyn huys jnd satten
yn in goidem gemach jnd deynden eme alre myldenclichste
alle noitturffticheit des leuens.
Wie he gesunt wart van der vssetzicht.

Up eyn naicht erscheyn der engel des heren, Michael, Amico in dem slaiff, jnd geboit eme, dat he dem greuen Amelio saicht, dat he doide syn ij soene, de [262](7) vmbtrynt iij yair alt waren, jnd dat he sych in erem bloede weschen soulde. jnd also soulde he gesunht verkriegen. Als dit Amelius hoirt, was he gedechtich der wasdait, dat sych Amicus vur in in dat perixel des doitz gesatte hatte. Jnd he nam eyn swert ind geynck zo dem bedde synre kynder, de da lagen ind sleiffen. Jnd he laicht sych auer sy jnd schrey alre bitterlichste. jnd sprach: 'Wer hat ey gehoirt, dat eyn vader syn kynder willenclichen haue gedoit? Leider mych myn alre si kynder vart, nie en sal jch uch neyt syn eyn vader, mer eyn bloedich stocker.' Jnd als de heisse trene alsus droeffen up de kyndergen, so wairden sy yntwachende. jnd, seynde eren vader, beguyntten sy in anzolachen. Jnd he sprach: 'Leider ure lachen sal gekoirt werden in schrien, want ure vnschuldig bloyt sal nu van urem vader verstoirt werden.' Jnd myt desen worden
ynthoufftgede he sy alle schwende. Jnd he vergaederde
dat bloit in eyn vass jnd bedeckde de houffdergen
synre kynder myt dën doiden lichnamen in ir bedgen,
jnd geynnck hyn jnd besprengde synen gesellen myt dëm
bloede, sachende: 'O her Jesum Christe, der den
myschen gebooden hais, den gelouwen zo behalden jnd
den vassetzigen man gereynget hais myt dyme worde,
[262v] wils dich gewirdigen, desen mynen gesellen zo
reyninchenc, vmb wes lieffde jch neit versaicht en
han, zo versturtzen dat bloyt nynre kynder.' Als dit
gescheit was, alzhantz wart Amicus gereynget jnd
Amelius dede in an myt* synen alren besten cleideren.
Jnd sy geynncken zamen zo der kirchen, vmb alle da
gode dem heren zo dancken. Jnd van der schickunge
gotz beguyntten alle de klocken zo liudcn, sunder
emantz trekken. Jnd als dat volck dat hoirt, quaemen
sy van allen syden alle verwunderende gelouffen. Jnd
als des greuen huissfrauwe sy beyde sach zo samen gain,
beguynt sy zo vraegen, wer van yntbeiden were yr man.
'Ich kennen ir gewant', sprach sy, 'sunder wer der

* den crossed out.
greue is en weyss ich neit.' Do sprach der greue:
'Joh byn Amelius jnd des is Amicus, myn gesell, der
gesunt geworden is. Vnderdesein so treckde der greue
mench siuchter, ouerlagende in syem hertzen den
doit synre kynder. Do geboit * des greuen
huissvrouwe, dat man auch ir kynder derbreicht, up
dat de vroude vermeirt wurde. Do sprach der greue:
'Laist sy resten in dem beheglichen slaiiff.' Her na
geynck Amelius alleyn in de kamer, up dat he alle da
syn kynder beschreien [263r7 moicht. Jnd he vaynt**sy
leuentich jnd spillenéc in erem betgen jnd vmb eren
heltzgeren erschenen de lyntzeichen na gelicheniss
eyns rodé syden vadvus. Jnd dat lyntzeichen
beheilden sy bis in eren doit. Jnd der greue nam sy
in syn armen myt groesser vrauden jnd satte sy up
den schois synre huissvrouwen jnd sprach: 'Ervrouwe
dich, alre liefsde huissfrouwe, want seyt vnse
kynder, de ich gedooyt hatte van geheisch des engels,
de leuen nu, jnd Amicus is gereynget myt erem bloede.'

Her na bleiiff Amelius myt synre huissfrouwen

* sprach crossed out

** corrected from vayt
leuende in reynicht jnd in dem deynst gotz
ynnenclichen. Euer de huissfrauwe Amici, wilche sere
baiss was, wart gegriffen van òem boessen geist jnd
starff vnselenclichen. Jnd Amicus vergaederde eyn
graijs her jnd belaichde de burch Beritanum also
lange, bis sy sich ouergauen vertwunnen. Jnd he
yntfeynck sy goidentenlichen jnd vergaff in alle ir
schant jnd woynde wart alle de zijt syns leuens myt
in in vreden.
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